

1694
p76

*Books Published by Edward Polhill
of Burwash in Suffex, Esq;
And Sold by Thomas Cockerill
at the Three Legs, over-against
the Stocks-Market.*

PRECIous Faith considered in its
Nature, Working, and Growth.
In 8v°.

Speculum Theologia in Christo : Or,
a view of some Divine Truths, which
are either Practically exemplified in
Jesus Christ, set forth in the Gospel,
or may be reasonably deduced from
thence. In 4t°.

Christus in Corde : Or the Myſtical
Union between Christ and Believers,
conſider'd in its Reſemblances, Bonds,
Seals, Privileges and Marks. In 8v°.

A Discourse of Schiſm.

15 + 18
Feb 10 1798

1694
p76

*Books Published by Edward Polhill
of Burwash in Suffex, Esq;
And Sold by Thomas Cockerill
at the Three Legs, over-against
the Stocks-Market.*

PRECIous Faith considered in its
Nature, Working, and Growth.
In 8v°.

Speculum Theologia in Christo : Or,
a view of some Divine Truths, which
are either Practically exemplified in
Jesus Christ, set forth in the Gospel,
or may be reasonably deduced from
thence. In 4t°.

Christus in Corde : Or the Mystical
Union between Christ and Believers,
consider'd in its Resemblances, Bonds,
Seals, Privileges and Marks. In 8v°.

A Discourse of Schism.

15758
Feb 10 1798

A *Jno Taylor's* 1720

DISCOURSE
OF
SCHISM.

By that Learned Gentleman,
EDWARD POLHILL, Esq;,
Late of *Barwast* in *Sussex*.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Thomas Cockerill*, at the
Three Legs, over-against the *Storks-*
Market. MDCXCIV.

A

DISCOURSE

OF

SCHISM.

By that Learned Gentleman,

EDWARD POLHILL, Esq;

Late of Barrister in Saſſex.

L O N D O N :

Printed for Thomas Cockerill, at the
Three Legs, over-against the Stocks.
MDCXCIV.

TO THE
READER.

TIS not the design of this Preface to commend the Author of the ensuing Treatise; his own Works do that sufficiently. He was a very Learned Gentleman, and a Justice of the Peace, of very great esteem among all men in his own Country, where he lived in full and constant Communion with the Church of England. And therefore being no Clergy-man either of one sort or other, he is the more likely to write impartially about Schism; and being no Frequenter of any of the Dissenters Meetings, he cannot reasonably be supposed to be byass'd in their favour. But yet on the other hand, he was far enough from entertaining any of those Prejudices against their Persons or Assemblies, which it hath been the

the great endeavour of some to infuse in-
to the minds of all men, but especially of
the Magistracy and Gentry. He was
zealously concerned for Truth and Seri-
ous Religion, not for a Party. On all
occasions he shew'd himself to be one of a
truly Christian (that is, of a Catho-
lick) Temper, and was a sincere lover
of all good men, of what Persuasion
soever. He was fully convinced, and so
wilt thou too, if thou diligently perusest
and readeest the following Discourse, that
Bigotry is the dangerous Schism, the
guilt whereof a man is not necessarily
involved in, or secured from, by the
bare being of this or that Party among
us.

of England. And therefore being
a clergy-man, either of our sort or
other, he is the more likely to write
impartially about Schism; and being
no Frequenter of any of the Dissenting
Assemblies, he cannot reasonably be
supposed to be biased in their favour.
But yet on the other hand, he was
far enough from entertaining any of
those Prejudices against their Persons
or Assemblies, which it hath been
the

Books

C H A P. I.

The Church-Catholick two-fold, The very mystical Body of Christ, or The totum integrale made up of all the Particular Churches. The Unity of the Church a Divine thing: Doth not consist in Human Rites; in a Liturgy; Diocesan Episcopacy, or the Civil Laws of Magistrates. Its true Unity in its internal Essence, and external Communion. A particular Church.

Christians, as high motives as they have to Unity, are yet divided, not only by the existence of Schism, but about the notion of it. The Papist charges it on the Protestant; one Protestant charges it on another; and the Reason is, because they differ in their measures of Church-Unity. Some require more to it than others; the Papist will have the Unity of a Visible Head; some Protestants

will have an Unity of Human Rites and Modes : Hence there comes a *Schism about Schism*. The very *notion* divides us. In this case it is worth the while to enquire into the true nature of Schism ; in the doing of which two things must be premised. Something must be spoken of the *Church* ; and something of the *Unity* of it.

First, Something must be spoken of the Church. In the *Old Testament* we have *קָהָל* which is a word derived from Congregating ; in the *New* we have *Ἐκκλησία*, which is a word derived from *Evocating*, or calling out. The *Jewish Church* being shut up in one Nation could meet all together in one place ; the *Christian Church* being spread over the World, cannot indeed meet all together in one place, but they are *cetus evocatus*, a company called out of the World to the Worship of God. The Church may be considered as *Catholick*, or *Particular*. The *Catholick Church* may be taken, either as the very mystical Body of Christ, or

as a *totum integrale* to all the particular Churches on Earth. As the *mystical Body* of Christ it is *invisible*; made up only of *real Saints*; all of them are internally united to Christ the Head; all are animated by the Holy Spirit; all have the Joints and Bands of Grace; all have the effectual working in their hearts. This is the *Church-Catholick* in the Creed; this is the *Παρθενον*, the *Assembly of the first-born*, *1 Cor. 12. 23*. This is in *Clemens Alexandrinus* called *Ἀθροισμὸς τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν*, the *Congregation of the Elect*. Here are no *damnata membra*, as *St. Austin* speaks. As Christ's natural Body did consist all of pure Members, so this mystical Body doth consist of true Believers. As in every Member of the natural Body there is an Human Spirit, so in every Member of the mystical Body there is the Spirit of Christ. Such is the *Catholick Church*, as it is the mystical Body of Christ. But as it is a *totum integrale*, made up of all the particular Churches on Earth; so it is, as its parts are, *visible*; and made up of good and

bad. Some are living Members, Partakers of the Spirit of Christ; some are dead ones: Some are in internal conjunction with Christ, some are in external only: Some are in the Church really, and before God; some are in it only apparently, and before men. Thus the Church is a Field which hath Wheat and Tares; a Net, which hath good Fish and Bad; a Floor, which hath Corn and Chaff. In *Isaac's* family there was an *Esau*; in the Colledge of Apostles, a *Judas*; in the visible Church there are foolish Virgins as well as wise; some have only the Lamps of Profession, whilst others have the Oyl of Grace. This may serve for the Church-Catholick. Now *particular Churches* are but *partes similes Ecclesie Catholicae*, *similar parts of the Catholick Church visible*. The Catholick Church is as the *whole Tree*, *Particular Churches* are but *Branches*. That is the main Ocean; these are but Arms, and Creeks of it. To that (as *Mr. Hudson* observes) the Promises and Privileges

vileges primarily belong; to these they belong in a secondary way. That is the first receptacle of Ordinances, these derive them from that. In every particular Church there is (as St. Cyprian speaks) *Plebs Pastori adunata*, a People joined to a Pastor for the performance of Divine Worship. Here the Word is preached, the Sacraments are administered.

2dly, Something must be spoken of the *Unity of the Church*. The Unity of the Church is that whereby the Church is one. There are many Members, but one Body; many Sheep, but one Fold; many Stones, but one Building. The Apostle reckons up many Unities appertaining to the Church. There is *one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of all*. Here is *unitas principii*, one God that calls the Church; *Unitas termini*, one Heaven that is hoped for by it: *Unitas mediorum*, one Faith, one Baptism,

to join men to Christ; and the Church: *Unitas Capitis*, one Lord Jesus, who is the vital Head of the Church: *Unitas Corporis*, one Body, in which the Members do all adhere one to another, and to the Head: And *unitas Spiritus*, one Holy Spirit to animate and actuate the whole Body.

The Unity of the Church is not an *Human* thing, but *Divine*. The Unity is as the Church is, *built upon the foundations of the Apostles and Prophets*, Eph. 2. 20. All the *Joints* and *Bands* which tie the Church together, are from *Christ the Head*. As under the *Old Testament*, God ordained the *Loops* and the *Taches*, that coupled the *Curtains* together, to make one *Tabernacle*, Exod. 26. 6. So under the *New*, Christ hath ordained the *Bands* and *Ligatures*, that couple *Believers* together, to make one Church: Hence this Unity is stiled by St. Cyprian, *Unitas à Domino, & per Apostolos tradita*: An *Unity* delivered from the Lord Christ, and by the *Apostles*; and by St. Austin, *Unitas*

Epist. ad
Cornel.

Unitas Christi, the Unity of Christ. *Contra*
 St. Jerom, speaking of the Church of *Cresc. l. 2.*
 Christ as joined together in the unity *c. 31. l. 4.*
 of the Spirit, hath this notable Pas- *c. 21.*
 sage. *Ecclesia habet urbes legis, Pro-* *Com. in*
phetarum, Evangelii, Apostolorum: *Mich. c. 1.*
Non est egressa de finibus suis, id est, de
Scripturis Sanctis. The Church hath
 its Cities, the Law the Prophets, the
 Gospel, the Apostles, it goeth not out of
 its bounds the Holy Scriptures. That
 only is Unity which is found there.
 When the question was between the
 Catholics and Donarists, *Ubi sit Ec-*
clesia? Where is the Church; the Co-
 lumba unica, the Dove that is but one?
 St. Austin tells them, that it was to
 be sought, *Non in verbis nostris, sed* *De Unit.*
in verbis Capitis; Not in our words, *Eccl. c. 2,*
but in the words of the Head. *c. 3.*
 Jesus
 Christ the Head knew his own Body:
 And again, *Sunt certe libri Dominici,*
ibi queramus Ecclesiam: There are the
 Lord's Books, there let us seek the
 Church: And again, *Nolo Humanis*
Documentis, sed Divinis Oraculis San-
ctam Ecclesiam demonstrari. I will not
 have the Holy Church demonstrated by

Human Documents, but by Divine Oracles. It was the notable Obser-

Fuit aliquando tempus quo immaculata Dei Sponsa Ecclesia summâ concordia tranquillissimâ pace, & intemperatâ veritate fruebatur, cum simplicitatem, & puritatem Evangelicæ Doctrinæ maximi omnes faciebamus, solis Sacris eloquiis contenti, his inhærentes, his acquiescentes, in unum ab his collecti ovile sub uno Pastore omnes agentes. *Crab. Conc. Florent.*

vation of Bessarion, Archbishop of Nice, *That then the Church had the highest concord, peace and truth, when it did adhere to the simplicity and purity of the Evangelical Doctrine, contented with the Sacred Oracles, inhering and acquiescing in them only, collected by them into one fold, and living under one Pastor.* The only

true Unity of the Church is that which is to be found in Scripture. When men will have an Unity not of God's making, but of their own, it falls out as when a piece of new cloth is put to an old Garment, there is a *griova*, a rent made. The Humane thing that did seem to fill up the Churches Unity, doth make a breach in it. *Victor* will have one *Easter-day*, and this little thing rents off the *Eastern Churches* from the *Western*. The Unity of a visible Head in the Church

Church is very plausible, yet this is but a piece of *Donatism* to have the Church only *in parte Papa*. 'Tis (as *Gregory* said against *John of Constantinople*) *Titulus in discissionem Ecclesie*, a Title to rent the Church in pieces. Nay, the very Roman Church (where it was hatched) is rent by it. Part would have a Council above the Pope: Part would have the Pope above a Council. The Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* call the Popes Schismatics, and the Popes have cast off and reprobated those Councils. Thus those Human things in the Church, which are set up for Unity, turn to *Ataxie*; and like the *Egyptian* Reed, pierce and rent that hand that leans on them.

These things being so, it appears that the Unity of the Church doth not consist in any Human thing. But to instance in some particulars.

1st. It doth not stand in *Human Rites and Observations*. In the first Golden Age (in which, as *Egesippus* saith the Church continued a pure Virgin)

Virgin) there was little or nothing of Ceremony, but much of Unity. Christians were then *of one heart, and of one soul*, Acts 4. 32. In after Ages Human Observations creeping into the Church, they were observed *varie & pro arbitrio*. Christians varied in the observation of *Easter*; some kept *Easter* on one day, some on another. They varied in their observation of *Lent*. Some fasted one day, some two, some more, some forty. They varied not only in the number of the days, but in their abstinence. Some eat Fowl with their Fish; some were contented with dry bread only. They varied also in many other Human Observations, as may be seen in Ecclesiastical Story. In all these there was *no unity*, yet the *true Unity* was not wanting. They did not put unity in such things, no; the Rule was, *Differentia rituum commendat unitatem fidei*, *The non-unity in Rites commended the Unity of the Faith*. The Christians were wont to fast, *ex arbitrio, non ex imperio*; out of choice, not out of command. St. Austin, speaking of the various

Euseb. l. 5.
cap. 23.

✓ Socrat.
Hist. l. 5:
c. 21.

Soz. Hist.
l. 7. c. 19.

Tert. contra
Psych.
Epist. 118.

various Customs in the Church, saith,
 that in such kind of things there was
libera observatio; indifferent things re-
 mained indifferent; one did not impose
 them upon another; so there was no
 breach of Unity. When the question
 was, whether there should be in Bap-
 tism *trina* or *simplex mersio*; St. Gre-
 gory answered, *In unâ Fide nihil officit*
diversa consuetudo; In one Faith a di-
 verse Custom hurts not. In the Coun-
 cil of *Lateran* under Pope *Innocent*
 the Third, *Can. 9.* it is ordained,
 That where in one City, or *Diocess*,
 there were people of divers Tongues and
 Rites, *sub unâ Fide*, there the Divine
 Offices should be performed, *secundum*
diversitates Rituum & Linguarum
Luther, speaking of the Popish Ce-
 remonies, saith truly, *Sub Papâ est*
pompa externa unitatis, sed intus non
nisi confusissima Babylon. Under the
 Pope is the pomp of external Unity,
 but within there is nothing but a most
 confused Babel. It is certain Church-
 unity doth not consist in Rites; let
 men fancy what they will, there is
 but one healing Rule to be found, *In*
nece-

Conc. To-
let. 4.
Can. 5.

Crab. Conc.
Tom. 2.

*necessariis unitas, in non-necessariis
libertas, in utrisque charitas.*

2dly. It doth not stand in a *Liturgy*, or prescribed Form of Prayer. The Church for some Centuries was without a Liturgy, but never without Unity. The Liturgies ascribed to St. Peter, St. James, St. Mark, are plainly spurious; there are to be found the words *Ὁμοῦν & ὁμοῦν*, which were not extant in the first Centuries. There mention is made of *Temples, Altars, Monasteries*, such things as the Primitive Church knew not. In *Justin Martyr's* time the Minister prayed *ὡς δύναμις αὐτοῦ*, according to his ability. In *Tertullian's* he prayed, *Sine monitore quia de pectore, without any Prompter but their own heart*. In St. Cyprian's time the Ecclesiastical Lector was to read *præcepta & Evangelium Domini*, not a Liturgy. In *Constantin's* time, had there been a Liturgy, he had not needed to have composed a Prayer for his Army. In the time of *Socras*, among all Forms of Religion, there

Apol. 2.

prope finem.

Text. Ap.

cap. 30.

Epist. 34.

de Celer.

Euseb. de

Vit. Con-

stant. l. 4.

c. 20.

Soc. Eccl. 1.

l. 5.

c. 21.

there were not two that consented together *in precandi more*. Set-forms of Prayer were not introduced into the Church, till the *Arian* and *Pelagian* Heresies invaded it, and then to prevent the diffusion of Heretical Poyson, Set-forms came in. In the Council of *Laodicea*, holden about the Year 368. *Can. 18.* it was ordained, that there should be *eadem preces* : But this was a Form of the *Minister's own composing*, as appears by the 23^d Canon of the Third Council of *Carthage*, holden about the Year 399. which appointed that none should use a Form, unless he did first *conferre cum fratribus instructoribus*. After which, in the *Milevitan* Concil, holden about the Year 416. *Can. 12.* it was ordained, that the Form used should be *approved of in a Synod* : Still this was a Form of the Minister's own making. It was many years after this before a Liturgy was absolutely *imposed* on Ministers, that they might not pray by their own Gifts only, but by the prescribed Forms of others. About the
Year

Year 800. *Charles the Great* being Emperor, Pope *Adrian* moved him to *establish a Liturgy* by a Civil Edict, and obtained it: And this is said to be *Gregory's Liturgy*. Thus the Church was much longer without a Liturgy than it can be imagined to have been without Unity. Therefore Unity doth not consist in it.

3dly. It doth not stand (as I take it) in a *Diocesan Episcopacy*. There are *Bishops* in Scripture, but no *Diocesan* ones. There are *Presbyters* ordained in every City, but no *Bishops* ordained to be over them. In *Thessalonica* there were not one, but many *ἐπίσκοποι*. 1 *Thess.* 5. 12. The Presidency there was in many, not in one. The *Bishops* at *Philippi*, *Phil.* 1. 1. being more than one in one city, were no other than *Presbyters*. The *Presbyters* at *Ephesus* are in express terms called *Bishops*, *Acts* 20. 17, & 28. *St. Peter* exhorts the *Presbyters* to feed the Flock of God, *ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, acting as *Bishops* among them, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. *St. Paul* would have *Titus* ordain *Presbyters*

Presbyters in every City, for a Bishop must be so and so. Tit. 1. 5, 7. If the Bishop and Presbyter were not here the same, the reason, (which must not be imagined,) would be inconsequential. There are the qualifying Characters of a Bishop set down in 1 Tim. 3. and in Titus 1. 7. but there is not one of them but is requisite in a Presbyter, not one of them peculiar to a Diocesan Bishop. The Scripture Evidence is very clear, that a Bishop and a Presbyter are all one. When Acrius brought some of these Scriptures to prove it, Epiphanius, who calls him Heretick, gives only this poor Answer, That in many Churches there were no Presbyters; but who can believe that at that time there were more Bishops than Presbyters; that, when there were more Bishops in one City, there should be no Presbyters at all there. It is a thing altogether incredible. Clemens, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, makes Bishops and Presbyters all one. Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, mentions only Presbyters and Deacons. In the Epistle ascribed to Ignatius ad Magnesios,

*Salm. in
App. ad
Primat.
fol. 50, 54*

nesios, a Bishop above a Presbyter is
 Salm. in called *νεωτερον τιζεις*, a novel Institution.
App. fol. 57. St. Ambrose saith, *Episcopi & Pres-*
 Com. in *byteri una ordinatio est*, there is but one
 1 Tim. 3. ordination of a Bishop and a Presbyter.
 Epist. ad St. Jerome saith, *Apud veteres iidem*
 Ocean. & *Episcopi & Presbyteri fuerunt. Ancient-*
 ad Evagr. *ly Bishops and Presbyters were the same.*
 Com. in Again, That the Bishop was greater
 Epist. Tit. *than the Presbyter, consuetudine magis*
quam Dominicæ dispositionis veritate,
rather by custom, than by any true di-
spensation from the Lord: And again,
that before, Communi Presbyterorum
Consilio Ecclesiæ gubernabantur. The
Churches were ruled by the Common
Council of Presbyters. St. Austin saith,
that Episcopacy is greater than Pres-
 Epist. 19. *bytery, Secundum honorum vocabula,*
quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, accord-
ing to the Titles of Honour which are
now used in the Church. Thus it ap-
pears that a Diocesan Episcopacy is
but Humane, and by consequence
Church-unity doth not stand in it.
The Reformed Churches which are
without Episcopacy, are not without
Unity. I conclude this with the Judg-
 ment

ment of the Learned Dr. *Ward*, who
 (speaking of the difference in Ecclesi- *Determ.*
 astical Government which is between 109.
 our Church and those beyond Sea)
 saith, that it may, and ought to be
tolerated, absque fraternæ unitatis læ-
 sione, *without any breach of Brotherly*
unity.

4thly. It doth not stand in *the Civil*
Laws of Princes. When Magistrates
 were *Pagans*, there was yet a Church,
 and an Unity in it. When they became
 Christians, the Unity was the same,
 the Joins and the Bands were as be-
 fore, *sacred*, not *civil*; from *Christ*
 the Head, not from the *Magistrate*.
 It's true, the Church hath an external
 help and guard from good Laws, but
 its Unity doth not consist in them.

Neque quia regna dividuntur, ideo & De Unitate
Christiana unitas dividitur, cum in Eccles. c. 12.
utraque parte inveniat *Catholica Ec-*
clesia, saith *St. Austin*, *Kingdoms may*
be divided, but Christian Unity is not;
in both parts the Catholick Church is
found. Should the Unity of the Church
 consist in the Laws of Magistrates,

C

then

then the Laws being dissolved, there would be no Unity ; the Laws being altered, the Unity must vary, and turn about to every point, as the Laws do. That which now is Unity, under a contrary Law must be Schism ; that which now is a Schism, under a contrary Law may be Unity. Under the Emperor *Valentinian*, the Orthodox may be the Church ; under *Valens*, the *Arrians* may be it. Nay, as the Magistrate may be, you shall not know by him where the Church or the Truth is. In that great Schism, when the Bishops of the *East* and *West* fell out about the Council of *Chalcedon*, some would not part with a syllable of it, some utterly rejected it : The Emperor *Anastasius*, *Aulicâ Sapientiâ usque*, banished some of both Parties, *equale premium veritatis & mendacium tulere*, Truth and Falseness were alike rewarded. Hence it appears, that the Unity of the Church doth not stand in Humane Laws, the true Unity is founded only in Scripture.

Magd.

Cent. 6.

cap. 8.

Evagr. l. 3.

c. 30.

These

These things being so, I come to lay down the true Unity. The Church may be considered, *ἐσωθεν* in its *internal Essence*, or *ἐξωθεν* in its *external Communion*. In the first consideration it hath *invisible Bands* to make it one; in the second it hath *visible ones*. The soul of the Church is, (as *St. Austin* speaks) *internal Grace*, the Body of it is *external Profession and Communion*.

Take the Church in its *internal Essence*, so its Unity stands in the Holy Spirit, and the Graces of it. *There is one body, and one spirit*, Eph. 4. 4. There are many Members in the Mystical Body of Christ, but they are all but one Body; and why so? They are distant in place and time, yet they are but *one Body*; distinct Bodies have distinct Spirits, but they have but *one Holy Spirit*, which unites them not only to Christ the Head, but one to another; so they must be but one Body, because they have but one Spirit to actuate them. Hence *St. Austin* saith, *Non potest vivere Corpus Christi nisi de Spiritu Christi*, The Body of Christ can- in Joh. Tract. 26.

not live but by the Spirit of Christ. It is the Holy Spirit that makes them one living Body.

*Enarr. in
Pfal. 37.*

*De ascensi
Domini,
Serm. 5.*

Under the Spirit there are three Uniting Graces which make the Mystical Church but one; they are *Faith, Hope, and Charity*. Hence that of *St. Austin, Si Fides nostra sincera sit, & Spes certa, & Caritas accensa, sumus in Corpore Christi.* If our Faith be sincere, our Hope certain, our Charity kindled, then are we in the Body of Christ. Hence St. Bernard observes a triple Vertue in the Primitive Church, *Magnanimity, Longanimity, and Unanimity*; the first was from *Faith*, the second from *Hope*, the third from *Charity*. Faith unites all the Members in the Mystical Body to Christ the Head, and so they are *one in Capite*. Love unites them not only to the Head, but one to another, and so they are *one in Corpore*. Hope unites them to one center in Heaven, and so they are *one in Termino*. In these things stands the Unity of the Church in its internal Essence.

Take

Take the Church in its *External Communion*, so its Unity stands in the *Holy Ordinances*. They continued steadfastly in the *Apostles doctrine*, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers, Acts 2. 42. These are the golden Bands that tie the Church together. As the Church *mystical* is made one by *Graces*, so the Church *visible* is made one by *Ordinances*: As the same Graces are all over the one, so the same Ordinances are all over the other.

The same pure word is preached. The Church (saith St. Jerome) *Non* Com. in Psal. 133. *in parietibus sed in dogmatum veritate consistit*, It doth not stand in Walls, but in True Doctrines. The Hereticks, as the same Father goes on, may have the Walls, but the Church is where the Truth is. The *Arians* boasted of their Unity, Contra Auxent. but as St. Hilary tells them, it was but *Unitas Impietatis*, an Unity of Impiety. The Unity of Truth is in the Church only; there all have one Law, one Charter; all are *σύνωμοι, συμμέτοχοι* & *ἐπαγγελία*, *concorporated and copartners of the promise*, Eph. 3. 6. No
C 3 body

body of men hath such a Law or *Charter* as the Church hath.

Contra
Fauft. Ma-
nich. l. 19.
cap. 11.

The same Sacraments are administered. These are Seals of the Churches Charter, and Symbols of that Communion which we have with Christ as Head, and one with another as Fellow-members. In Baptism we enter into the Holy Society; in the Lord's Supper we are Fellow-commoners, and eat together as Members of the same Family. St. *Austin* saith, That in every Religion men are joined together, aliquo signaculorum consortio, by a fellowship in some Seals. No Society of men hath such Seals as the Church hath.

Ignatius,
Epist. ad
Magn.

The same Prayers in substance are made; tho in the Primitive times there was no Common Prayer, or Liturgy in the Church, yet there was ever *δὲνός κοινῆς*, a Common, that is, a Publick Prayer, which in the mouth of the Minister is as it were breathed out by all the people, that the Divine Blessing may come down upon the Word and Sacraments.

I shall here add nothing touching Ecclesiastical Discipline, because the par-

particular *mode* of it is not *so essential* to a Church as the other are.

To conclude, *Where there are lawful Pastors dispensing Holy Ordinances, and a People meeting, and unanimously joining in the use of them, there is a True Church* ; Hic est fons Veritatis, hoc Templum Dei, hoc domicilium Fidei, as *Lactantius* speaks, *There is the Fountain of Truth, the Temple of God, the Dwelling-place of Faith.*

These things being premised touching the Church, and its Unity ; I come now to enquire into the Nature of Schism.

C H A P. II.

Schism defined. Seminal or Actual. In the Church, or from it: There may be a Schism without Separation; and a Separation without Schism. The Characters of Schismatical Separation, Voluntariness, want of Charity, Pride, Error, breach of Sacred Unity, for little or no Cause, from the Catholick Church.

*De Unitat.
Eccles.*

SCHISM is the Scissure of the Church visible, a breach of the sacred Unity of it without cause. 'Tis a Scissure of the Church, a renting, *vestem Christi inconsutilem*, the seamless Coat of Christ, as St. Cyprian speaks. It was (as St. Austin speaks) signified by the breaking of the net, Luke 5. 6. The net at Sea brake, propter significanda Schismata, to note out the Schisms of the Church on Earth; but the

Ibi Ecclesia in hoc seculo, hic in fine seculi figurata est Austin in Joh. Tract. 122.

Net drawn to the Shore brake not, John 21. 11. to note out, that the Saints in Heaven are, *in summa pace*,
in

in the highest unity. No Schisms are in that blessed Region.

'Tis a Scissure of the *Church Visible*. In the *Church Mystical* there are no Schisms. It's true, *the Flesh* (which in the Saints warreth against the Spirit) is a *Schismatick*, and makes such rents in their Souls, that they are in a sort divided from themselves. *It is not I, but sin that dwelleth in me*, saith Saint Paul, Rom. 7. 20. He distinguisheth his corrupt Self from his renewed Self. But yet that Flesh cannot, shall not totally, finally rent them off from the *Mystical Body*. They may fall into sins, yet those Principles which tie them to the *Mystical Body*, are not extinct; the Spirit of Grace will not leave them, but raise them up out of their Falls. Hence St. Austin saith, *Si in aeternum caput, in aeternum & membra, If Christ the head be for ever, so are the Members*. Schism then is not in the *Church Mystical*, but in the *Church Visible*.

In Psal. 88.

'Tis a breach of the *Sacred Unity* in the Church, I mean of an Unity founded in Scripture; every breach of that
Unity

Unity is Schism; but a breach of an
Human Canon or Law is not Schism.

*De Unit.
Eccl.*

St. Cyprian (shewing the madness of
Schismaticks) saith, *Quis audeat scin-*
dere Unitatem Dei? Who dares cut in
pieces the Unity of God? So he calls

*Contra
Cresc. l. 5.
c. 21.*

the Churches Unity, because it is not

Humane. *St. Austin* saith, *It is a great*

evil to make a Schism, ab Unitate Chri-

sti, not from man's Unity, but from

Christ's; and the same Author calls

*Contr. Lit.
Pet. l. 2.
c. 30, 81.*

Schism in divers places, *Sacrilegium*

Schismatis, the Sacrilege of Schism,

because the Unity is not Human, but

Divine. When the Papists charge

Schism upon us, as casting off the

Pope the Head of Unity, the Learned

*Traet of
Schism,
157.*

Dr. Hammond answers, *He was never*

appointed by Christ to be Head; and then

Answer is found, No such Unity was

appointed in Scripture.

Again, 'Tis a breach of the Sacred

Unity *without Cause*. When the

Orthodox Christians separated from

Arian Bishops, who subverted the

Faith of Christ, it was no Schism at

all. When the Protestants came out

of Idolatrous Rome, it was no Schism,

but

but a Duty. *Causa* (say the Canonists) *non secessio facit Schismaticum*, it is not the separation, but the cause that makes the Schismatick.

Schism is either *seminal* or *actual*. *Seminal* Schism stands in the carnal and corrupt Lusts of the Heart; these are the bitter Roots and Springs of Division. *Whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not of your lusts that war in your members?* James 4. 1. Were there no warring Lusts within, there would be no jarring but Discords without. The Apostle, speaking of the Divisions in *Corinth*, saith, *Are ye not carnal, and walk as need men?* 1 Cor. 3. 3. Divisions come from the Carnal part in Christians, not from the Spiritual. *St. Austin*, was speaking of *Abraham's* dividing the Beasts, but not the Birds, saith by way of allusion, *Carnales inter se dividuntur, Spirituales nullo modo*, Carnal men are divided one from another, but not the spiritual. The Lusts of men are the great Make-bates. But to instance in some particulars. *Pride* is an horrible Schismatick; by swelling it breaks in-
to

De Civ.

lib. 16.

cap. 24.

to a rupture ; by lifting up a man above himself, it divides him from his Brother. The greatest instance of Pride in the World is the Bishop of Rome ; he sits, as he pretends, in the Infallible Chair ; he hath all Laws *in scrinio pectoris* ; he claims all Power, Sacerdotal and Regal ; he stiles himself the Head of the whole Church ; he is called a *God on Earth* ; his Title is, *Dominus Deus noster Papa* ; and after all this state, he is no less an Instance of Schism than of Pride. He rents himself off from the Church Universal ; he will not be a Member in it, but an Head, a Universal Lord over it. The Church must be only *in parte Papa*, and no-where else. All the Protestant Churches in the World must be cast off as Schismaticks, and this abominable Schism must be stiled Unity. Again, *Self-love* is a great Schismatick ; it so appropriates all to it self, that it leaves nothing in common ; it is such an inordinate uniting of a man to himself, that he cannot be joined to others. That little word (*Ego*) is a strange divider of all Society.

ty. When *Novatus* fell off from the Church, and became the Head of the *Cathari*, there was somewhat of *self* in it. The denial of an Episcopal Pre-ferment made him set up a Church for himself; and in that Church, before he gave the Eucharist, he made the Communicants swear by the Body and Blood of Christ not to forsake him. To name but one thing more, *Hatred* is also an inward Schismatick; it dissolves what Love unites, and sets a man against his Brother, to whom he should be joined in amity. *Origo* Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 6. c. 42. *Schismatis est odium fraternum*, saith De Bapt. l. 1. c. 11. St. *Austin*, *The hatred of a Brother is the origin of Schism*. In the Council at *Ephesus*, called *Concilium praeatorium*, the *Eutychian* hatred broke out sadly against the Orthodox. The Bishops that favoured that Heresy, carried the matter by mere force and violence, crying out, *Qui dicit duas Naturas, in duo dividit*. He that confesseth two Natures in Christ, divides him into two. Such a desperate thing is Hatred, that it prompts men to divide even unto blood. Such Lusts as these

these are the roots of gall and worm-wood, which bear the bitter fruits of Schism and Division.

Actual Schism is either a *Schism in the Church*, or a *Schism from it*.

A *Schism in the Church* stands in the Differences and Dissentions of the Members in it. We have in the Church of *Corinth* three instances of it. They differed about the Excellencies of their Teachers. *Every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*, 1 Cor. 1. 12. They differed about the manner and time of the Holy Eucharist. *They did not wait one for another, the rich contemned the poor*, 1 Cor. 11. 21, 22. They differed about the variety of Gifts among them; the inferior in gifts envied the superior, and the superior in gifts despised the inferior; the *feet* envied the *hand*, and the *head* undervalued the *feet*; 1 Cor. 12. 15, & 21. And every one of these differences is in these Texts called *gorsora*, a *Schism in the Church*; and the reason is, because every one of them did break the Unity of the Church in Ordinances. When they

they lookt more on the Teacher, than on the Truth, there could not be an intire communion in hearing the pure word, they heard it but partially in the gifts of one, rather than of another. When at the Lord's Supper they did not wait for, but condemn one another, there could not be an unanimous conjunction in that Ordinance. The Eucharist, the Seal and Bond of Union, was as it were rent and torn in pieces. When the inferior in gifts envied, and the superior despised, they could not worship and serve God like those, *Acts 2. 1. ὁμοθυμαδὸν, with one accord.* Those Differences did make a breach upon that Worship that should have been intire. Now here it is to be noted, that *every difference* among Christians doth not amount to Schism. There was a *Persecution*, a hot fit between *Paul* and *Barnabas*, yet *no Schism*, *Acts 15. 39.* In the Church of *Corinth*, Brother went to law with Brother, *1 Cor. 6. 6.* The Apostle blames the difference, but calls it not Schism. *Stephen*, Bishop of *Rome*, was against Rebaptization ;

Cyprian

*De unico**Bapt. c. 14.*

Cyprian, Bishop of *Carthage*, was for it; yet there was no Schism; *Ambo* in unitate Catholica constituti, saith *St. Austin*, both remained in Catholick unity. There were differences between *Chrysostom* and *Epiphanius*, between *Jerom* and *Austin*, yet it would be hard to charge them with Schism. The *Lutherans* differ from the other Reformed Churches in some lesser Truths; but because they agree in fundamental Articles, there is not properly a Schism; the difference, *non impedit*, *ἐκλόνοισιν πίστεως*, *hinders not the unity of the Faith*, saith *Dr. Ward*. But then Differences amount to Schism when they break the unity of Faith, or the unanimous Communion in Ordinances. Such were the Differences above-mentioned in *Corinth*; there was no separation from the Church there; yet because those Differences broke the unity of Ordinances, they are called Schism.

Determin.
fol. 3.

A Schism from the Church stands in a criminous separation from it. The word *σχίσμα*, when it relates to the Church, doth, as I take it, only de-

note

more in Scripture, *Divisions in a Church*. But the word *dissectus*, doth seem to denote division *from a Church*. Such a kind of dissention, in which men separate one from another in body and place, as well as mind. Yet in that, 1 Cor. 3. 3. it seemeth to be no more than division in a Church. However this be, the word *dissectus* Lev. Jud. 19. doth properly signify *to separate*, or put ones self *extra terminos Ecclesie*, out of the bounds of the Church. Now this Schism from a Church is either *negative* or *positive*. *Negative* Schism is, when men separate from a Church, and go no further; no new Church or Assembly is set up. *Positive* Schism is, when there is not only a simple Separation, but a new Church or Assembly is instituted, in which the Word and Sacraments are administered. This is called *strenue ultra contra Altare*. A *negative* Secession may in some case be lawful, as when one is unjustly ejected out of a Church he may recede from it. Yet (saith the Learned Camero) a *positive* Secession in that case is not lawful, he may not

De Eccles.

325.

immediately set up a new Church, at least not without some other Reasons or Circumstances.

Touching this Separating Schism, it is first to be noted, that there may be a Schism without a Separation, and there may be a Separation without a Schism.

There may be a Schism without a Separation, *as in the body*, 1 Cor. 12. 25.

when there is no schism from it. There was not (for ought I can see) any Separation in the Church of Corinth.

Yet the Dissentions there making a breach upon the Communion in Ordinances, did amount to Schism.

De Unit.
Eccl.

St. Cyprian saith, That all believers are in one House. The Church, saith he, is

unanimitas hospitium, a House of unity and unanimity, where they sweetly

dwell together in the unanimous Worship and Service of God. If a man do

not go out of this House, and leave the Unity of it; yet if he make Dis-

sensions there, and disturb that Unity, he is guilty of Schism.

Against

Again, There may be a *Separation without a Schism*. In many Cases one part of a Congregation may depart from the other, and become a Church of it self, and yet there may be no Schism at all. What if it be done in a Congregation too great to meet together, for convenience, and by common consent? This will be no Schism at all. 'Tis but as when *Abraham* and *Lot* parted asunder, because the Land was not able to bear them: Or, as when the Hive being too little for the Bees, one part goes away, and dwells by it self in a new Family. What if there be a *Law or Canon made to allow such a Separation*? It will hardly be called Schism; and yet Church-unity doth not vary as Human Laws and Canons do, for then it might be something or nothing, as men please. If in a Church the foundations of the holy Faith be destroyed, what can the Righteous do? Join they cannot, separate they must. When *Eunomius* the *Arian* was made a Bishop, not one of his Flock, rich or poor, young or old, man or woman, would communicate

Theod.
L. 4. c. 14.

nicate with him in the Service of God, but left him to officiate alone. When *Nestorius* did first publish his Heresy in the Church, the people made a noise, and ran out of the Assembly.

Evagr. l. 3.
cap. 5.

When under the Emperor *Basiliscus* five hundred Bishops condemned the Council of *Chalcedon*, it was hard for Christians to join with them. The Church is where the Truth is, and no where else. What if the terms of *Communion* be sinful? we are rather to break with all Churches, than to commit one sin against God. The breaking off from him is more than breaking off from all men. Thus in some cases there may be a Separation without Schism. Indeed Schism is not a mere local defection, but a moral one.

De Bap.
cont. Don.
l. 1. c. 1.

Non discessit in corporalibus motibus, sed spiritus aliam astringendi, sicut St. Athanasius, Tunc de partibus est non se bene servare, sed corporalibus motibus, sed by spiritualibus: but enough of this.

In the next place, I shall endeavour to lay down some Characters, whereby it may be known when Separation is Schismatical.

ST. JOHN

1

1st. Schif-

1st. Schismatical Separation is intentional, and perfectly voluntary. Thus the *doctores exiles*, those that separate themselves, Jud. 19. do by their own voluntary act put themselves out of the bounds of the Church. Thus they that went out of the Apostolical Church, 1 Joh. 2. 19. did it intentionally and freely. It is the observation of *Aquinas*, That as in natural things, that which is by accident doth not constitute the Species: So in moral, not that which is besides the intention, for that is accidental; hence he infers, *Peccatum Schismatis proprie est speciale peccatum, ex eo quod intendit se ab unitate separare quam charitas facit. Proprie Schismatici dicuntur, qui propria sponte & intentione se ab unitate Ecclesie separant.* The sin of Schism is a special sin, in that it intends to separate from that unity which charity makes. Schismaticks are properly those, who of their own accord and intention do separate themselves from the unity of the Church. It's true, every Schismatick doth not say as *Marcion* did, *Ego fundam Ecclesiam*, I will cleave the Church

2, 22.
quaest. 39.
Art. 1. c.

Cro. lib. 3.
Blunden.

Aust.
Epist. 162.

Cypr. de
Unit. Eccl.

in two; yet this is that which he means in his Separation. As in our Common-Law, when we would know whether an entry amount to a *disseisin*, we enquire, *quo animo fecerit, with what mind it was done*. So in Theology, if we would know whether a Separation amount unto Schism, we must enquire *with what mind it was done*. Schism, saith Dr. Hammond, is a *voluntary dividing*. The Schismatick is he that divides himself from the Church; not he that is cut off from it, but he that goes out, and recedes of his own accord. He condemns himself, being out of the Church, not by Censure, but *suo arbitrio*, by his own free Choice. The *Donatists* were in their minds and wills so set upon their own way, that after a long series of Debates and Hearings, they were still the same as before. A right Schismatick makes it his business to divide; *A Matre Filios segregat, Oves a Pastores sollicitat*; He severs the Sons from the Mother, he entices the Sheep from the Pastor. This is the first Character,

2dly. Schismatical Separation proceeds from *Hatred*, or at least from a want of *charity*. Quisque (saith St. Bernard) sibi unus debet esse per integritatem virtutis, & unum cum proximis per vinculum dilectionis. *Every one ought to be one with himself by the integrity of Vertue, and one with his Neighbour by the bond of Charity.* Love unites, but hatred divides, and breaks out into Schism. Nulli (saith St. Austin) Schisma facerent, si fraterno odio non excacarentur. *None would make Schisms, unless they were blinded with the hatred of their Brethren.* This Character was evident in the *Donatists*; hence the same Father tells them, *Sacramenta habetis, charitatem non habetis, Sacraments you have, but Charity you have not.* And withal, he tells them, that though they had, *multa & magna*, *many and great things*, yet all was nothing, *si unum defuerit*, *if that one thing Charity were wanting*; and what Charity they could have who allowed no Church but their own, I know not. When there are no just Scruples, no reasonable Causes of Separation,

In Asc.
B. Mar.
Serm. 3.

De Bapt.
con Don.
l. 1. c. 11.

Contra
Cresc. l. 2.
c. 10.

De Bapt.
cont. Don.
l. 1. c. 8, 9.

surely the departure must be for want of Charity.

3dly. Schismatical Separation issues out of *Pride and Contempt*. When they went out from the Apostolical Church, 1 Joh. 2. 19. there was somewhat of Antichristian Pride and Contempt in it; for in the verse precedent, *Antichrists* are said to be then in being. Those that separated themselves Joh. 19. did it, as a Learned man saith, *cum contemptu aliorum*, as if they had some peculiar Doctrine or Sanctity. This Character may be seen in the *Novatians* and *Donatists*. *Novatus* is said to be *Superbiâ inflatus*, *pufft up with pride*, when he set up his Separate Church, that he might be head of those who called themselves pure. The *Roman Synod* takes notice of this, and decreed, That he, *cum simul elatis*, with his proud companions, should be esteemed as Aliens to that Church. St. *Austin* saith of the *Donatists*, that *Superbi ruperunt rete & fecere altare contra altare*. Proud men broke the net, and set up Altar against Altar.

Euseb. 16.
cap 42.

It was indeed horrible pride in them to say, that the Church was *only in parte Donati*; and it is no less in the Papists to say, that it is *only in parte Pape*. For any one Party to boast, as if the Church were with them *only*, and not elsewhere, is Schismatical Pride, or proud Schism. Then is Separation a Schism, when it is done in pride and contempt.

4thly. Schismatical Separation is ordinarily, if not always, attended with some error or other. It is a very rare thing to see a mere simple Schism, sine ulla depravatâ Doctrinâ, without some mixture of depraved Doctrine. Every Zimri hath its Cosby; every Divider hath some lie or other to which he is joined. Neque Schismaeri potest, nisi diversum aliquid sequantur qui faciunt, saith St. Austin. Cont. Cref. Neither can there be a Schism made, unless they that make it follow some different Doctrine. Nullum Schisma non ubi aliquam fingit Hæresin ut recte Ecclesia recessisse videatur, saith St. Jerome; There is no Schism but it frames

Cont. Cref.

l 2. c. 7.

Com. in

Tit. c. 3.

frames to it self some Heresy, that it may seem to have rightly departed from the Church. Novatus did not only separate from the Church, but set up his own Error, That the lapsed were not to be received in the Church, no, not upon their repentance, no more than dead men. Donatus did not merely separate, but advanced his uncharitable Error; That the Church

De Unit.
Eccl. c. 11.

Theod.
Hist. l. 3,
5.

De Notis
Eccl. 2. 5.

was only in parte Donati; upon which account St. Austin tells him, that he did, aliud Evangelizare, preach another Gospel. Neither did the Luciferiani only separate, but they had their propria Dogmata, their proper Errors.

Thus the Learned Whitaker, Non est Schisma nisi cum Errore aliquo conjunctum fuerit. There is no Schism, but it is in conjunction with some Error. The Schismatick ever hath some peculiar Opinion to promote in the world, and upon that account he separates from the Church, and sets up for himself.

schly. Schismatical Separation is a breach of some Sacred Unity. The Schismatick doth indeed adhere to the Church

Church in part, but with all he breaks in part. There is some breach of Unity. He adheres to the Church in part, but not in all. St. Austin saith of the Donatists, *In multis erant mecum, in Schismate non mecum.* In many things they are with me, but in their Schism they are not with me. And in another place he saith, That they were with the Church in Sacraments, but not in *vinculo pacis, in the bond of peace.* Thus the Schismatick adheres in part, but then he breaks in part: There is some breach of sacred Unity, I mean of that Unity that is founded in Scripture. Hence St. Cyprian expostulates with the Schismatics, *Quis audeat scindere unitatem Dei, vestem Domini, Ecclesiam Christi?* Who dares break the Unity of God, the seamless Coat of the Lord, the Church of Christ? Hence St. Austin tells them, *Non est quicquam gravius Sacrilegio Schismatis;* There is nothing more grievous than the Sacrilege of Schism. Were there no breach of Unity, it would not be Schism; were not the Unity sacred, it would not be Sacrilege. Then is Separation Schism

Enarr. in
Psal. 54.

De Unit.
Eccl.

Contra.
Parm. l. 2.
c. 1, 11.

Schism when there is a breach of some
Sacred Unity.

Tract of
Schism.

6thly, Schismatical Separation is a
breach of Sacred Unity, for little or
no cause at all. The memorable
Mr. Hale's speaking about the Schism
touching the keeping of Easter, faith,
*This matter tho most unnecessary, most
vain, yet caused as great a Combustion
as ever was in the Church; the West
separating and refusing Communion with
the East for many years together. In
this fantastical Hurry, I cannot see
but all the World were Schismatics
neither can any thing excuse them from
that imputation, excepting only this
that we charitably suppose all Parties
out of Conscience did what they did.*
Thus he. This great Schism was for
just little or nothing, and so is every
Schism, that is properly so called.
The Separation is as the cause is.
When the cause is weighty and just
the Separation is innocent. When
the Cause is light and inconsiderable
the Separation is Schism. Schisma-
ticks are but *tanquam palea, as chaff*
and

and as St. *Austin* speaks, *Occasione venti
vi volans foras: A little Wind drives* Expos. in
Epist. Joh.
them out of doors.

7thly, Schismatical Separation is
not only from a particular Church,
but from the *Catholick* one. As by a
just Excommunication a Man is cast
out from the Church *Catholick*, so
by an unjust Separation a man casts
out himself from the same. The Re-
verend Primate *Bramhall* in his *Vin-
dication of the Church of England*,
lays down two things; the one is
this, If one Part of the *Universal
Church* separate it self from another,
not absolutely, or in essentials, but re-
spectively in Abuses and Innovations;
not as it is a part of the *Universal
Church*, but only so far as it is corrupt-
ed and degenerated, it doth still retain
a Communion not only with the *Catho-
lick Church*, but even with that cor-
rupted Church from which it is separa-
ted, except only in Corruptions. The
other is this, Whosoever separates
himself from any part of the *Catholick
Church*, as it is a part of the *Catholick
Church*,

De Unit.
Epist. Joh.

Epist. Joh.
Concl.
Epist. Joh.

De Unit.
Epist. Joh.

ut loquar
ad h. 1093

De Visib.
Eccles.

Epist. ad
Cornel.
l. 2. Ep. 11.

De Unit.
Eccles. c. 17.

Church, doth separate himself from every part of the Catholick Church, and consequently from the Universal Church, which hath no Existence but in its Parts. Thus that Learned Man. It is one thing to separate from a Particular Church as it is corrupted and degenerated; another thing to separate from a Particular Church, as it is a part of the Catholick Church. The Learned Dr. Prideaux saith, *Non habendus est Schismaticus, qui Romam aut aliam quamvis deserit particularem Ecclesiam, ob additamenta non ferenda; sed qui aversatur Communionem & unitatem Ecclesie Universalis & Catholice.* He is not to be esteemed a Schismatick, who forsakes Rome, or any other Particular Church, because of some Additions not to be born; but he that turns away from the Union and Communion of the Church Catholick and Universal. St. Cyprian charges it upon the Novatians, that they did, *Catholica Ecclesia corpus unum frindere: Cut in pieces that one Body of the Church Catholick.* St. Austin charges it upon the Donatists, *A Christiana unitate,*

unitate, qua toto orbe diffunditur, sacrilego schismate separatos esse: That they were by a Sacrilegious Schism separated from that Christian Unity, which is diffused over the whole world. Separation is then Schism, when it is from a particular Church, as it is a part of the Church Catholick; for then it is from every part of the Catholick Church, and by consequence from the whole Church.

These Characters may suffice to shew what Separation amounts to Schism.

CHAP.

C H A P. III.

The Separation of the N. C. is not Schism. Not voluntary. Not from want of Charity. Not from Pride and Contempt. Not attended with Error. No breach of Sacred Unity. Not for little or no Cause. The Rites and Ceremonies for which they separate no little things, as considered in themselves. Of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism. The Ceremonies, as terms of Communion, intrench on Christ's Kingly Office: Invert the Gospel; are against Christian Charity, Liberty and Unity. The Pleas for Ceremonies not satisfactory. Of Order and Decency. Whether the Ceremonies are parts of Worship. N. C. do not separate from the Catholick Church.

I Now go on to consider the Separation of the *Nonconformists*, Ministers and People, whether that be Schism or not; in the doing of which I shall review the former Characters with respect to them.

1st. Schif-

1st. Schismatical Separation is *intentional* and *perfectly voluntary*; but *quo animo*, do the *Dissenters* separate? In our Law an *entry* shall not be called a *disseisin*, *partibus invitis*, *against the will of the Agents*. Neither should a Separation in such a Case be in Theology called a *Schism*. Is it imaginable that the *intention* or *option* of the Nonconformists should be to be out of the Church, rather than in it? It is easy to judge who they be that most intend and love Church-unity; those who would have the *terms* of it *easy*, *plain* and *unquestionable*, or those who would have them clogg'd with *Scruples*. The Nonconformists separate; but their parting from the Church, like the Merchant's parting with his Goods in a Storm, is not *purely voluntary*, but a *mixt Action*, done with an unwilling will, not out of love to Separation, but to *salve Conscience*. When the Papists charge Schism upon our Church, what saith Bishop Bramhall? Schism is a *voluntary* Separation; *To be separated might be our Consequent will, because we could not help*

Reply to
the Bishop
of Chalced.
fol. 55.

it : but it was far enough from our Antecedent will, or that we did desire it. And a little after. If they did impose upon us a necessity of doing sinful things, and offending God, and wounding our Consciences, then we did not leave them, but they did drive us from them. And what saith Dr. Prideaux, *Fugati potius quam fugientes, non tam à Roma ut est secessimus, quàm ad Romam ut erat, regressi sumus*, We were rather driven away, than voluntarily flying ; we are not so much departed from Rome as it is, as we are returned to Rome as it was. In like manner, the Nonconformists being charged with Schism, may say, To separate is not their Antecedent will, but Consequent ; they depart from the Church, but it is by a kind of constraint ; they had much rather be in the Church ; they wish for it, pray for it, and *salva conscientia* would do any thing for it, but there are some things which they cannot join in ; Such a departure should not be called Schism.

2dly. Schismatical Separation proceeds from *hatred*, or at least from a *want of Charity*; but do the Nonconformists *thus* separate?

Schismatici discessionibus iniquis à fraternâ Charitate diffiliunt. *Aug. de Fide, & Symbol. cap. 10.*

What is done out of Conscience to God, cannot be fairly interpreted *hatred to our Brother*. It is love to God that causes men to walk according to Conscience; but it is want of love to him that makes them hate their Brother. These two cannot stand together. If we call that hatred which indeed is Conscience, we forfeit our own Charity by misconstruing the Charity of others. It is the desire of the Nonconformists to live in charity with the Conforming Brethren. In the Council of *Carthage* St. *Cyprian* and his Fellow-Bishops, in the point of rebaptizing those that were baptized by Hereticks, plainly erred and dissented from the rest of the Church; yet they were never charged with *Schism* for it, and why? Because they did *ut neminem judicantes, nec à iure communionis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes: Judging none,*

De Bapt.
cont. Don.
l. 1. c. ult.

Sentent. de
Pace 112.

removing none, that thought otherwise,
from the right of Communion. That
Error of Rebaptization, which in the
Donatists was, as St. Austin speaks,
*Fuligo in tartareâ feditate, the smoak of
their hellish filthiness,* was in St. Cypri-
an but, *nævus in candore sancta Anima,*
a freckle in the candor of an holy Soul;
and the reason was, because St. Cypri-
an had what they had not, *Charitatis
ubera, the breasts of Charity* to cover his
Defects. In respect of this Charity
Bishop Davenant saith, *Melius de Ec-
clesiâ meruit errans Cyprianus, quam
Stephanus Romanus recte sentiens, &
Ecclesias quantum in se fuit, Schismatico
Spiritu dilacerans.* Cyprian, erring,
deserved better of the Church, than
Stephen, Bishop of Rome, rightly
thinking, but by a Schismatical Spirit,
as much as he could renting the
Churches. Charity is a great thing,
and I hope it may be found among
the Nonconformists; they leave the
Church, *neminem judicantes, judging
none* of their Conforming Brethren.
the breasts of their Charity may cover
some defects. I hope therefore Schism

in this respect cannot be charged upon them. I am sure Charity is in all good men, Conforming or Nonconforming; but if we compare *Parties* together, that Party which *binds burthens on Conscience, and leaves them there*, seems to me to have less of Charity, than that which shrinks and withdraws the Shoulder from them.

3dly. Schismatical Separation issues out of *pride and contempt*. The *Donatists* thought themselves the *only* men; they boasted as if their Communion were the *only* Communion, as if their Baptism were the *only* Baptism. But do the Nonconformists separate *thus*? Do they say that *they only* are the Church, or that *they only* have the Ordinances? Do they despise their Conforming Brethren, or lift up themselves above them? No surely, they desire to be but as Brethren, and that one Brother might not *Lord it over* another. When our Divines charge

Si nostra communio
est Ecclesia, vestra non
est. *Aug. de Bapt. cont.*
Don. l. 1. c. 11.

Vos dicitis in nobis
Baptismum non esse.
Aust. contr. Cresc. l. 4.
cap. 62.

De Not.
Eccl. l. 4.
c. 10.

the Monasteries as Schismatical, because they have separate Meetings and Ordinances, *Bellarmin* answers thus. *Soli Schismatici sunt qui ita erigunt altare proprium, ut altare aliorum prophanum censeant.* They only are Schismatics, who so set up their own Altar, that they esteem the Altar of others profane. It is indeed one thing to have distinct Meetings for Worship, and another to have opposite ones. The Nonconformists have Meetings of their own, but without the contempt of others. The Jews say, he that contemns the Solemn Assemblies of the Church, hath no part in *Seculo futuro*. But where the distinct Meetings are without contempt, there, I suppose it is not to be called Schism. Here that may take place; *he that is not against the Church, is for it.* A candid Charity interprets all to the best.

Schisma
in Hære-
sim eru-
stat.

4thly. Schismatical Separation is ordinarily, if not always, attended with some Error or other. The *Novatians*, *Donatists*, *Luciferians*, had their *propria Dogmata*, their proper Errors.

Errors. Their Separations were to
 set up their Errors ; their Errors un-
 der pretence of Truth, were to justify
 their Separations. Hence St. Cyprian
 faith, that the Schismatics are, *Pestes* De Unit.
Eccles.
& lues Fidei, corrumpenda veritatis
artifices, the Pests and Plagues of the
Faith, the Artists in corrupting Truth.
 But as for the Nonconformists, what
new Doctrine do they bring? what
Error do they propagate? what
 deadly poison is under their Lips?
 Do they not fully and firmly ad-
 here to the Church (as *Optatus* Whit. de
Not Eccl.
cap. 8.
speaks) *in una Fide, in one Faith?*
 are they not joined together, *ut in*
manu digiti, as the fingers in the hand
pointing out the same pure Doctrine?
 Bishop Abbot, in his Book *De gratiâ &*
perseverantiâ, tells us of some Cor-
 rupters, *Qui veteres hareses denuo in* Præfat. ad
Lect.
Scenam producunt, & Pelagianâ lue
corrupti Gratia Divinæ vim nervosque
succidunt, Who bring up the old Here-
sies upon the stage, and having caught
the Pelagian Pestilence, cut asunder the
strength and nerves of Divine Grace.
 Not only some of our men, but Fo-
 reigners

Upon the
8th Arti-
cle.

*Præf. ad
Lett.*

*Ger. de
Ecclef.
cap. 6.
sect. 3.*

reigners too, have taken notice that the Plague of *Socinianism* hath been creeping in among us. Mr. Rogers upon the *Articles of our Church* tells us, that he heard a great Learned man speaking of *Zanchy's Book*, *De tribus Elohim*, call him a Fool and an Ass. *Arnoldus*, in his Book against the *Racovian Catechism*, takes notice of the *Socinian* Heresy creeping up among us. But do the *Nonconformists* propagate these Errors? Do they spread abroad the poison? Do they not steddily stick to the true pure Doctrine of our Church? And is not conformity in Doctrine much more than conformity in Ceremonies? Surely it is. It seems therefore hard to charge Schism upon them. He indeed goes out of the Church, who goes out, not in Body, but in Faith. Hence it was the judgment of *Gersom*, That in a simple Schism, without any depraved Doctrine added to it, when it is doubtful by whom the Schism is made, till it be lawfully determined, those that are Followers in it do belong to the Church.

5thly.

5thly. Schismatical Separation is a breach of some Sacred Unity. The Schismatick adheres to the Church in part, but withal he breaks in part. He adheres in part, or else he would be an Apostate. Thus St. Austin saith of the Donatists, *In quo nobiscum sentiunt, in eo nobiscum sunt, In what they think with us, in that they are with us.* Thus when the Donatists asked whether their Baptism did generate Sons to God; If it did not generate, why doth not the Catholick Church rebaptize them; but if it do generate, then ours (say the Donatists) is the Church. St. Austin makes this answer, That the Church of the Donatists doth generate, *Unde conjuncta est, non unde separata est. Separata est à vinculo, Charitatis, sed adjuncta est in uno Baptismate.* It generates as it is joined to the Church Catholick, not as it is separated from it. It is separated from the bond of Charity, but it is joined in one Baptism. Thus the Donatists were joined to the Church in part. Again, The Schismatick, though he adhere to the Church in part, yet withal he

De Bapt.
cont. Don.
l. 1. c. 1.

De Bapt.
cont. Don.
l. 1. c. 10.

De Bapt.
contr. Don.
l. 1. c. 1.

Contra
Cresc. l. 2.
cap. 3.

he breaks in part, or else he could be no Schismatick. Thus St. *Austin* faith of the *Donatists*, *In eo à nobis recesserunt, in quo à nobis dissentiunt, In that they are departed from us in which they dissent from us.* When *Cresconius* urged for the *Donatists*, that there was, *una Religio, eadem Sacramenta, nihil in Christiana observatione diversum; That on both sides there was the same Religion, the same Sacraments, nothing in Christian observation diverse.* (Which Plea by the way, had it been true, would have been good, there being no Schism where there is no breach of Unity.) St. *Austin* utterly denies it, and asks them, *Quare rebaptizatis? Why do you rebaptize those that were baptized in the Catholick Church? Indeed they thought themselves the only Church, and so broke themselves off from the Church Catholick.* Thus the Schismatick is partly in conjunction with the Church, and partly in separation from it; he adheres in one thing, and breaks off in another. But is it thus with the Nonconformists? Are not they

they joined to the Church in all that
 which is *truly Unity*? Have not they
 in their Meetings the *unity of Ordina-*
nances, the same pure *Word* preached,
 the same holy *Sacraments* administred,
 and this by *true Ministers of Christ*?
 And what other *Unity* is there in
 Visible Churches? Or what of true
 Unity is there between two Para-
 rochial Churches, which is not be-
 tween their Meetings and Parochial
 Churches? Abate but *Humane things*,
 in which *Church-unity* stands not, and
 they are not partially, but *totally in*
conjunction with the Church of England;
 and if so, there is no breach of *Unity*,
 and by consequence *no Schism* in
 them. St. *Austin* lays down a notable
 Rule; That he that acts, *Sicut in*
unitate agitur, as it is done in the unity;
in eo manet atque conjungitur, in that
he abides, and is joined, in all those
things wherein Unity stands. The
 Nonconformists act as the Church
 doth, therefore they are in *conjun-*
ction with it. St. *Austin* tells us, That
 the Church doth in the *Donatists* ac-
 knowledge, *Omnia quæ sua sunt, all*
things

De Bapt.
cont. Don.
l. I. c. I.

Contra
Cresc. l. 2.
c. 10.

things that are its own. Let the Conforming Ministers acknowledge all that of true Unity which is in the Dissenters Meetings, and they may perceive that their Brethren are in conjunction with them. Where there is a total conjunction, there is no breach of true Unity; and where there is no such breach, there is no Schism. But you will say, their departure from the Congregations in publick, is a Schism. I answer, Every *local* Separation is not a Schism, there is more in Schism than so. Every departure is not Schism. It is hardly to be called such, when those that depart do yet remain in conjunction with them from whom they depart. And this I think is the Case
 X of those that are Nonconformists.

6thly. Schismatical Separation is a breach of sacred Unity for little or no cause at all. Hence Irenaeus saith of the Schismatics, That *propter modicas & quasilibet causas, magnum & gloriosum Corpus Christi conscindunt*, for little and inconsiderable Causes they cut

in piéces the great and glorious Body of Christ. The Professors of *Leyden* say, *Synops. pur. Theol. Disp. 40.* That a Schismatical Church is that, *qua propter externos aliquos ritus, adic- φόpus, Communionem Christianam ab- rumpit, which for some external indiffe- rent Rites breaks Christian Communion.*

This Character seems *prima facie* to press upon the Separation of the Non-conformists. They separate for *Rites and Ceremonies*, which seem to be but minute and inconsiderable things; this therefore must be duly considered.

The Ceremonies of our Church may be considered under a double notion; either as they are in them- selves, or else as they are terms of Communion.

The Ceremonies, as considered *in themselves*, however innocent they seem to be to the Conformists, they are not so to the Nonconformists. To instance but in one of them. The *Cross in Baptism* is lookt upon as a thing unlawful, or at least as a thing very ill-coloured, and suspected to be unlawful. To explain this I shall lay down some few things.

1st. The

- 1st. The Sign of the Cross was indeed used among the Ancient Fathers, but not without a mixture of Superstition. Tertullian will have Signaculum Crucis to be necessary in every part of our life. St. Cyprian saith, That in hoc Signo Crucis salus sit omnibus qui in frontibus notentur, in this Sign of the Cross there is Salvation to all who have this mark in their Foreheads. Origen saith, That fear and trembling falls upon the Devils, cum Signum Crucis in nobis viderint, when they see the Sign of the Cross in us. St. Ambrose saith, That all prosperity is in uno Signo Christi, in that one Sign of Christ; he that sows in it, shall have a Crop of Eternal Life; he that journeyes in it, shall arrive at Heaven it self. St. Athanasius saith, That Signo Crucis omnia magica compescuntur, all Conjurations are repressed by the Sign of the Cross. St. Chrysostom saith, That all Sacraments are perfected Signo Crucis, with the Sign of the Cross. St. Austin saith, That unless the Sign of the Cross be applied to the Forehead of the Believers, or to the Water of Regeneration, or to the Oyl with which they
- De Cor. Mil.
Lib. 2. adv. Judæos.
In Exod. cap. 15.
Ser. 43.
De Incar. verbi.
In Matt. Homil. 55.
In Joh. Traff. 118.
- are

are anointed, or to the Sacrifice with which they are nourished, nihil eorum rite perficitur, none of these things are rightly performed. Such a use of the Cross as this is, Protestants cannot allow of. Only the Papists, who would have Humane Inventions do great things, make use of such Sayings in the Fathers.

Bellarmin.
de Imag.
lib. 2. c. 29.

2dly. The Sign of the Cross is an abominable Idol in the Popish Church.

Bellarmino (who doth distinguish the Cross into three parts, the True Cross, the Image of the Cross, and the Sign of the Cross) lays down this general Doctrine. *Omnes Cruces adoramus*, Bell. l. 2.

We worship all Crosses: And particularly of the Sign of the Cross he saith, c. 30. de Imag.

That it is, *Signum sacrum & venerabile*, a sacred and venerable Sign.

Aquinas saith, That the Image of Christ is to be adored, cultu latriæ, the

Sign is to have the same adoration as the thing it self. And how? which

way is it that such an horrible Idol should be retained in a Church Protestant, and pure from Idolatry? The

Brazen

Part 3.
2. 25.
Art. 4.
c. 30. de Imag.
lib. 2. c. 29.

Brazen Serpent was ordained by God himself, and yet when it was abused to Idolatry, *Hezekiah* broke it to pieces, and called it *Nehushtan*, a piece of brass, 2 *Kings* 18. 4. . It was a singular Figure of Christ. The lifting of it up upon a pole for corporal Cures, did by *Divine* Ordination type out the lifting up of him upon the Cross for spiritual; yet becoming an Idol, it was no more to be endured: And why should the Cross, a mere *Human Invention*, being once so abused, ever be tolerated? The Children of *Israel*, *Hos.* 2. 16, 17. were not to mention the names of Idols, that is, *honoris gratiâ*, in any way for their honour. The Fifth Council of *Carthage*, Can. 15. would have all Idolatrous Reliques utterly extinguished. *Constantine the Great* would not suffer the least Rag or Memorial of Pagan Idolatry to remain: And it is very strange, that such an Idol as the Cross should be retained in a Church free from Idolatry.

Crab. Conc.
Tem. 1.

Euseb.
Vit. Constant. l. 3.
47, & 52.

3dly. The

3dly. The Sign of the Cross in our own Church, though it be no Idol, yet is an Image; it is not indeed ~~not~~ a graven Image, but it is ~~not~~ a *similitude of Christ crucified*. Representation is the very essence of an Image; and the Sign of the Cross is intended to *resemble* Christ crucified.

Aquin.

As the Sacraments are by God's Institution representative Images of Christ's Passion, so is the Cross by

Pars 3.

Q. 83.

Art. 1.

Man's; and what doth an Image do in Divine Worship? The Second

Commandment shuts out all Images from it; nay, under that notion, it would shut out the very Sacraments, were they not of Divine Ordination.

Anciently the Christians would not suffer Images to be in their Churches.

When the Emperor *Adrian* com-

Æl. Lam-

manded Temples to be made *without* images, it was presently conceived

prid. in

vita Alex-

andri.

that he did prepare them for *Christians*. The *Eliberine* Council would

Conc. El.

Can. 36.

Epiph.

Epist. ad

not admit that *Pictures* should be in Churches. *Epiphanius* rent the Vail

Joh. Hie-

rosol.

that hung in the Church of *Anablathu*, because it had the *Image of Christ*, or

F

some

some Saint in it. *Serenus* Bishop of *Marſiles*, brake down the Images in his Church. The Emperor *Theodoſius* and *Valentinian* removed, *quodcunque Signum Salvatoris*, every Sign of a Saviour out of the way. Thus Images have not been admitted into Churches; and how then should they be brought into Ordinances, which are much more sacred than Places? The Image of the Cross should not appear in Divine Worship, in which no other Image is to be admitted, but that, *quæ hoc est quod Deus est*, which is that which God is; that is, Jesus Christ the Image of the Invisible God.

Aust.

Epist. 119.

cap. 2.

Lastly. The Sign of the Cross is an addition to Baptism, and so utterly unwarrantable. Under the *Old Testament* it was unlawful to add to the Ceremonial Law of God, *Deut. 4. 2*. And how should it be lawful under the *New* to add to the Ceremonial Law of Christ? Christ was as faithful in the House of God as *Moses*; his provision was as perfect for Rituals, as that of *Moses* was. Nay, the Worship under

the *Old Testament* being more Shadowy and Ritual, and that under the *New* more pure and simple ; an addition to this is less tolerable than to that, because the purer the Worship is, the more impure is the addition. The Prophet *Ezekiel*, speaking of the Glory of the Evangelical Church, that it was the place of God's Throne, and of the soles of his feet ; adds this, That they should no more set their thresholds by God's, or their posts by his, *Ezek.* 43. 7, & 8. they should not add their own Inventions to God's Precepts. When the *Corinthians* joined, *ἰδιον δειπνον*, their own supper to the Lord's, it was unjustifiable ; and the Apostle expostulates about it, *Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in ? or despise ye the Church of God ?* 1 *Cor.* 11. 22. Are there not distinct Houses, and distinct Suppers ? why do you join the Civil Supper to the Sacred ? The Apostle against such mixtures alleged that Institution, *I have received of the Lord that which I deliver unto you*, v. 23. Man may not add to what is from God. When the

Parker of
the Court
102. 102
102. 102

Epiph.
Heres. 49.

Council Al-
tissidor.
Can. 8.

Crab.
Tom. 2:
Anrelia. 4.
Can. 4.

Whit.
Tom. 1. 501
191, 192.

Armenians added *sod ment* to the *Lord's Supper*, it was condemned by a General Council. When the *Artotyrita* brought in their *bread and cheese* into it, it was abominable; when they brought in their *mulsam* or *mellitum* into it, the Church calls it, *aliud poculum*; another cup; and that, *ad grande peccatum & reatum pertinet*, it amounts to a great sin and guilt, as being an addition to *Christ's Institution*. It's true, the Fathers in this Council did through infirmity admit, *Vinum cum aqua mixtum*, a mixture of *Water* with *Wine*; but another Council will not admit, no not of a little water mixt with the *Wine*, and adds this reason for it; *Quia Sacrilegium judicatur aliud offerri, quam quod in Mandatis Sacratissimis Salvator instituit*. Because it is judged *Sacrilege* to offer any thing besides that which our Saviour instituted in his *Sacred Commands*. When *Duraeus* cites many Fathers for the many Ceremonies added to *Baptism*, the Answer of the Learned *Whitaker* is very excellent. *Mea non interest quid Clemens, quid Leo, quid Damasus* per-

qui

quid quisquam alius Pontifex ad Baptismi Sacramentum adjecerit; Christus Ecclesie nihil de istis Ceremoniarum nugis mandavit! I am not concerned what Clemens, Leo, Damasus, or any other Pope hath added to the Sacrament of Baptism; Christ left to his Church nothing in command touching such trifling Ceremonies. Sadeel against the Monks of Burdeaux, speaking touching their many Ceremonies added to Baptism as an ornament to it, makes this Answer. *Nam igitur sunt prudentiores Jesu Christo, qui instituit Baptismum tantâ cum simplicitate & puritate, quæ melius novit, quam omnes simul homines, quæ illi convenient ornamenta? Homini licet pactionem (inquit Paulus) auctoritate confirmatam nemo abrogat, aut quid ei super addit. Quæ est ista arrogantia adjicere institutioni Jesu Christi? Are they wiser than Jesus Christ, who instituted Baptism with so great simplicity and purity, and who knows much better than all men put together what Ornaments are proper for it? Though it be but a man's Covenant (saith St. Paul) yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth*

Sadeel:

Art. 11.

fol. 492.

or addeth thereunto. What arrogance then is it to add to the Institutions of Jesus Christ? This is charged upon the Cross, it is an addition to Baptism; a Sign of Man's added to the Sign of Christ.

ytbly. The Sign of the Cross is not merely an addition to Baptism, but it is a *mystical Teacher*, and looks very like a *Sacrament*. It is a *mystical Teacher*; as the Sacraments teach Christ crucified by God's Ordination, so doth the Cross by Man's. But is not the Scripture sufficient and Christ the great Prophet? And may Man invent new ways of teaching; or if he do, may any one look for the illuminating Spirit in such ways? Christ is the one Master, the one Teacher by way of excellency; all other Teachers that teach truly, do but teach ministerially under him; he hath ordained the perfect means of reaching the Church, and all other means are as none at all. The Cross not reaching under him, teacheth not truly; and being none of his means, hath none

Christus
habet cla-
vem ex-
cellentiae,
Alii tan-
tum cla-
vem Mi-
nisterii.

of

of his blessing. If the *Cross* might be a true Teacher, then the standing *Images* of *Christ* might be so too, which though called by the *Rapists* *Lay-mens Books*, do yet but make men forget God. Again, the *Sign* of the *Cross* looks very like a *Sacrament*. *Baptism* is a *Symbol* of our *Christian Profession*, so is the *Cross*. *Baptism* hath a word annexed to it; *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*. So hath the *Cross*, *We sign this Child with the Sign of the Cross*, in token that he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of *Christ crucified*. *Baptism* points out *Christ crucified*, so doth the *Cross*. *Baptism* casts the baptized into the *Church*, so doth the *Cross*. *We receive this Child into the Congregation of Christ's flock*, and sign him with the sign of the *Cross*. As *Baptism* admits into the *Church Catholick*, so the *Cross* admits into a particular *Church*. *Baptism* dedicates the *Infant* unto *Christ*, so the *Cross* dedicates him to the service of him that died on the *Cross*. And what now is wanting to make it a *Sacrament*? It

Cam. 30.

is not *vehiculum gratiae*; It's very true, it is not: Neither can any *Human Invention* be such. It therefore looks *as like a Sacrament as any Human thing can do*, no such thing being capable of conveying Grace unto men.

In the next place the Ceremonies of our Church may be considered *as terms of Communion with it*: That is, there must be a Surplice, or no preaching; a Cross, or no baptizing; a kneeling posture, or no Lord's Supper. These things, though they are very light to the Conformists, are not so to the Nonconformists. I shall therefore consider them in some particulars.

1st. The Ceremonies thus taken do seem to intrench upon *the Kingly Office of Christ*. He is the one Lord and Lawgiver of his Church. 'Tis his Royal Prerogative to institute Sacraments. This is confessed by the *Papists* themselves. *Aquinas* (relating that some held their Sacrament of Confirmation was instituted in some Council,

Part 3.

2. 72.

Art. 1.

cil, and that others held it was instituted by the Apostles) saith, this cannot be, because to institute a new Sacrament, pertinet ad potestatem excellentiæ, appertains to the power of excellency, which is in Christ alone.

Bellarmin proves that Christ is the only Author of Sacraments. It is a flower of his Crown to institute Ordinances, no man may take this glory from him. The Apostles, the highest Officers in the Church, were not Lords of it, but Ministers and Stewards under Christ, 1 Cor. 4. 1. to do his pleasure. They taught only what he commanded them, Matt. 28. 20. St. Paul preached *ad id quod scriptum est*, nothing without Scripture, Act. 26. 22. He would not go beyond his Commission. Non

debent Episcopi (saith the Excellent Whistaker) *suas traditiones aut leges, aut contra, aut extra, aut præter Evangelium obtrudere.* The Bishops ought not to obtrude their Traditions or Laws, either against, or without, or besides the Gospel. That Gospel which is the Law of Christ, is the Canon that must rule all their Canons. Christ hath the full Royal Power,

De Sac.
l. 1. c. 23.

Tom. 2.
fol. 722.

In legibus
Ecclesiasticis, Eu-
ragia,
tantum
spectatur.
Whit.
Tom. 2.
721.

Aust.
Epist. 118.

Power, the Church hath only a limited Power from him. Christ may make Laws of Institution, the Church can only make Laws of Execution, or Disposition, such as tend to the right and orderly disposing of those Ordinances which were instituted by Christ. The Apostles did not institute any thing of Worship or Ordinances. But they did take care that the Ordinances should be used in a way suitable to their dignity. These things being so, the only Question is, Whether the Church hath any Patent or Commission from Christ to institute or impose mystical Ceremonies as terms of Communion? In answer to this, I take it, the Church hath no such Power or Commission. The Pattern of Christ and the Apostles is more to me than all the Human Wisdom in the world. It is the observation of St. Austin, That Christ's Yoke being easy, he did, *Sacramentis in-
mero paucissimis, observatione facillimis,
significatione praeclarissimis societatem
novi populi colligens*. Tie together the Society of a new People with Sacraments few in number, easy in observation, and excellent

excellent in signification: And who
 would depart from this simplicity?
 I am sure the Apostles did not. They
 delivered only that which they received
 of the Lord, 1 Cor 11. 23. *Hoc fidei* De Or.
Err. lib. 2.
c. 5.
illorum erat, & officii, saith Bullinger.
 This was their faith and duty. They did
 believe (saith the same Author) that
 Christ was the wisdom of God, ne in
 mentem ipsorum venit, it came not
 into their minds to add Ceremonies to
 Christ's Institutions. The Primitive
 Christians continued stedfastly in the
 Apostles Doctrine and fellowship, and in
 breaking of bread, and prayer, Acts 2.
 42. There was nothing but the pure
 Institutions of Christ, not an additional
 Ceremony to be seen among them.
 Nay, in Justin Martyr's time, we find Apol. 2.
 the Lord's Supper used in pure simpli-
 city; and why should we make our
 additions to the Sacraments? St. Cy-
 prian contra Aquarios, expresses him- Epist. 63.
 self notably touching the Lord's Sup-
 per. *Ab Evangelicis Præceptis omnino*
recedendum non est. We must not depart
 from the Evangelical Precepts. And a
 little after, *Non nisi Christus sequendus*
est,

Tim. 7.
fol. 727.

ed. Aug.

Epist. 119.

est, solus Christus audiendus est. Christ only is to be followed, Christ alone to be heard. Again, Human Ceremonies are not congruous to the pure light of the Gospel. Num Divina Figura sublata sunt, ut Humana succederent? saith Learned Whitaker, Were the Divine Figures taken away, that Human might succeed? If the Divine Shadows under the Law did all vanish before the Sun, the pure and Evangelical Light; may Humane Umbra's come and overcloud it? Surely it cannot be. It was the saying of a great Doctor once in the Church of England, That in the morning of the Law the shadows were larger than the body; and it will be a sign of the evening and sun-set of Religion, if these shadows shall be stretcht out again, and outreach the body. If the Church may institute or impose two or three Ceremonies, it may do more and more; till men under the pressure cry out, as St. Austin did, Tolerabilior sit conditio Judaeorum, The condition of the Jews would be more tolerable than that of Christians. Moreover, none but God alone can institute a Ceremony to signify

signify a mystery in Religion; he only hath authority over Religion, he only can bind the Conscience, he only can illustrate the mind, he only can give a blessing to such a Sign. *Aquinas,*

speaking of the Sacraments, saith, That the Signifier should determine the Sign; and God is the Signifier, who signifies spiritual things to us by sensible things, in Sacraments, and by similitudinary words in Scripture. If God be

the great Signifier of Holy Mysteries, it is his right to determine the Signs of them. By these things it appears that the Church hath no power to impose Mystical Ceremonies; and by consequence in so doing she incroaches upon the Royal Prerogative of Christ. *Edward the Second* granted to the Nobles a power of making some Laws; but if they under colour of that had made other, they had invaded his Prerogative. The Lord Christ hath given the Church power to make Laws of *Execution*; but if

Determinare quo Signo sit utendum pertinet ad significantem, Deus autem est qui nobis significat Spiritualia per res sensibiles in Sacramentis, & per verba similitudinaria in Scripturis, *Aquin. part. 3. Qu. 60. Art. 5.*

Walf. Hist. 70.

she

she go beyond her Line, and make Laws of Institution, she seems to encroach upon his Royalty.

2dly. The Ceremonies thus taken do seem to *invert the Gospel*. The Apostle tells the *Galatians* that they were removed to another Gospel, which was not another; but there were some that troubled them, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ, Gal. 1. 6, 7. The word in the Original is not *anagapōlay*, to *ever*, but *metaspōlay*, to *invert* the Gospel. They did not deny the Gospel, but they added the Jewish Ceremonies to it, and so inverted it, and made it to be another Gospel; a Gospel mixed with Jewish Ceremonies, being not the same with it self in its purity. And as those Jewish Ceremonies did invert the Gospel, so do ours, the upon a different reason, invert it also. Theirs did invert it, as being made necessary to Salvation, ours do it, as being made terms of Communion. In the pure Gospel Heaven and Ordinances do both stand open unto men in the Church. The Gospel is
inverted

inverted not only when men are barred out from Heaven, by making other necessities to Salvation than are required therein, but also when men are barred out from Ordinances by making other terms of Communion than are commanded therein. This latter is that which I shall explain by Humane Instances. If a Prince grants a Charter of Franchises to a person, and, as it passes the Great Seal, the Chancellor of his own head adds a Condition to the Grant, the Charter is hereby inverted. When King *Edward the First* confirmed the *English* Charters with this addition, *Salvo jure corone nostre*, the Nobles were displeased, and would not be content, till their Charters were confirmed as they were at first granted, in an *absolute* manner. They were sensible that a *new modus* might make their Charters look like another thing than indeed they were. If a man covenant or article with another, that he shall enjoy such a thing, and without orders a Condition be superadded, the Covenant is inverted. When the Emperor *Charles the Fifth* made

Walf. Hist.
fol. 44

Thuan.
Hist. l. 5.
fol. 106.

made an Agreement with the Duke of Saxony, and superadded a Condition that the Duke should be of his Religion, the Duke utterly refused it; the addition made the Covenant another thing. If a man make his Will, and the Scribe of his own head add a Condition to a Legacy, the Will is inverted; hence in the Civil

Qui Testamentum,
amoverit, deleverit, in-
terleverit, falsum scrip-
serit, legis Corneliae pec-
nā damnatur. Corp. Jur.
Civ.

Law the *Falsarius* is greatly punished. If a Law of Grace be made, and the Judge will by his interpretation put a Con-

dition of his own upon it, the Law is inverted. *Magna Charta* gives unto the Church *omnia sua jura integra, & libertates illas*. Should a Judge tell Ecclesiastical Persons, that they should have all their Rights and Liberties, but upon a Condition of his own devising; who would not conclude that the great Charter was inverted? In all these Instances it is not material, whether the Condition be added to the thing in writing, and so embodied with it, or whether it be added to it by practical use; in both cases it inverts the

the thing to which it is added. Now the Gospel is the Grant, Covenant, Testament, Law of our Lord Jesus Christ : In and by it he makes over Ordinances freely, absolutely, to all that will come to them. If men put in their own Conditions, and say, you shall have Sacraments, but upon these or those terms, which are unnecessary and unrequired by Christ, the Gospel is inverted, and made another thing than it was; an *absolute free* gift is one thing, and a *limited conditional* one is another. The first is the Gospel in its purity, as it comes from the hands of Christ; the last is the Gospel with a mixture, as it is inverted by men. Neither is it material, whether that which is added be a great thing, or a *little*; a *little* thing, if added as a Condition, inverts it; because it turns an *absolute free* disposition into a *conditional* one. I conclude with that of St. Chrysostom upon that Text, Gal. 3. 7. *They subvert the Gospel who bring in, mixen tu, paululum quiddam, any little new thing into it; that is, if it be brought in as necessary*

Comment.
in Gal.

to Salvation, or as a Condition to any Ordinance of the Gospel.

3dly. The Ceremonies thus taken do seem to be against *Christian Liberty, Charity and Unity*. They seem to be against *Christian Liberty*. The Liberty which we have in Christ is a real one. *Omnia* (saith *Tertullian*) *imaginarie in seculo*; All things, even Liberty it self, are imaginary in the world; but the Liberty which we have in Christ is true. Our Christian Liberty stands in a spiritual manumission, not only from Sin, Satan, Death, but also from the *Yoke of Ceremonies*. In the Gospel we have a double Door open to us, one into Heaven, another into Ordinances, to fit us for that Blessed Region; both these open Doors were purchased by the precious Blood of Christ, neither of them may be shut by man. The Jewish Ceremonies, as made necessary to Salvation, did shut the first Door, because there more things were made necessary to Salvation than the Gospel made. Our Ceremonies, as made *terms of Communion*, seem to shut the second Door, because

because thereby other Conditions of participation in Ordinances are put upon men than are to be found in the Gospel. A free access unto the Sacraments was not only purchased by Christ's precious Blood for us, but granted by his Evangelical Charter to us; and a choice, a rare Liberty it is; but if men may bar up, or conditionate this access, where is our Christian Liberty? How can we come to Ordinances, *ως ἐλεύθεροι*, as the Freemen of Christ? The Human Yoke of Ceremonies is upon us; and I wonder that it can enter into rational minds, that God should break off the Yoke of *his own Ceremonies*, as unsuitable to the Evangelical Liberty, and yet that a *Yoke of Human Ceremonies* should be put on as congruous to it. If Human Ceremonies may succeed in the room of Divine, then the Yoke is not removed, but changed, and that as much for the worse, as Human Ceremonies weigh heavier than Divine. Were it put to the option of any intelligent man, whether he would have a Ritual Burthen of God's binding laid upon him,

him, or one of *Man's*: He would certainly chuse to have it done rather by the God of Wisdom and Mercy, than by any Creature. We see clearly that God hath no-where in the *New Testament* laid any such burthens, or set any such conditional bars to Ordinances; and how, or why should man do it? Or if he do it, how or which way is the *Christian Franchise* preserved? The Church's Power is but subordinate, and subalternate to Christ, and how can it put bars or conditions to that Priviledge which he hath granted to Christians? When a Church useth its Power according to the line and level of Scripture, then all is well; but when it overflows, and exceeds its Commission, then Christian Liberty goes to wreck.

Again, They seem to be against *Christian Charity*, as being stumbling-blocks to doubting Souls, occasioning their fall into sin. Our Dear Lord Jesus left us the Sacraments pure, Divine, altogether free from any scruple. But now the mystical Ceremonies are so interwoven and coupled in use with them,

them, that Scrupulous Christians, in partaking of that which Christ institutes, run into that which Conscience scruples; and in following that which is lifted up in the Example of Pious and Learned Church-men, fall and wound their Souls. The law of Charity puts a restraint upon indifferent things in the case of Scandal. *It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak,* saith the Apostle, *Rom. 14. 21.* Indifferent things are in charity to be abstained from in case of scandal. The Apostle presseth this by very weighty Arguments. *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, v. 17.* Religion doth not stand in such things. We must not in such things *grieve or destroy our brother, v. 15.* We must not for them *destroy the work of God, v. 20.* that is, our Brother's Soul, which is his work by way of eminency. We must not *destroy him for whom Christ died, v. 15.* Scandal in indifferent things is not a wounding only, but a killing of our Brother, a kind of Soul-murder. Now if indif-

ferent things, in case of scandal, are not to be admitted in common use, much less are those things (which have *speciem mali*, an appearance of evil) in such case to be admitted into holy Sacraments; thither we come by Christ's appointment, not to grieve and wound, but comfort and heal our Souls. Charity should not suffer any Stumbling-block or Scandal to be seen there, every thing there should minister comfort and edification. I know many Answers are given to this, but scarce any satisfactory ones. 'Tis said, that in case of scandal we must abstain from indifferent things, whilst they remain indifferent, but not after they are determined by Authority. But to me it sounds exceeding harsh, to say, that in case the Magistrate commands it, we may wound or destroy our Brother. A Scandal in its nature is spiritual Murder, which no Command of Man can make tolerable. Avoiding of Scandal is a main duty of Charity, which no Command of Man can dispence with. 'Tis said, that in conforming to the Ceremonies, there can be only a scandal to a Brother,

brother, but in nonconforming there is scandal to the Magistrate; and this indeed (if it be a Scandal of the same kind, is greater than the other. But (as Learned Mr. Jeans doth distinguish.) There is a two-fold acception of Scandal, primary and secondary; primary scandal is the occasioning the fall of another into sin. Secondary is the angering and displeasing of another. Conformity to the Ceremonies occasions our Brother to fall into sin, Nonconformity only occasions the displeasure of the Magistrate. Now to displease the Magistrate is surely more tolerable, than to occasion the poorest man to fall into sin. This is clear, because it is more dangerous to displease God than Man. 'Tis said further, Debts of Justice are to be paid before debts of Charity: Obedience to Superiors is a debt of Justice, a matter of right; but the not giving of offence is a debt of Charity, a matter of courtesy. But as Mr. Jeans hath fully answered, The Rule must be understood, *ceteris paribus*, when the terms of comparison are equal; and equal they are not, when the *Minims of Justice* are put into the Ballance with the

Schol. &
Præf. Di-
vin. par 2.
fol. 127.

weightiest duties of Charity; and so 'tis in the present comparison. Of what importance is the practise of a Ceremony, in comparison of not scandalizing our Brother? Who can imagine that the command of a Ceremony can bear proportion with the command of not destroying a Brother? The Commands of God touching the externals of Worship, are to give way to Mercy. *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, saith God, Hos. 6. 6.* much more must the Commands of Men do so. Besides, the care of not giving offence, tho so my Brother, it be but a debt of Charity, yet in regard of God, it is a debt of Justice; and wee to him through whom the offence cometh. Moreover, it is said, that *the offence by the Ceremonies is only Scandalum acceptum, non datum, a Scandal taken, not given.* But the Ceremonies being not merely things indifferent, but having at least an appearance of evil, the Scandal is not *taken* only, but *given*. It is certainly our duty to abstain from all appearance of evil. The Nazarite was to abstain from the very Husk of the Grape. The Young
man

man was not to come nigh the door of the strange Woman. *Secundus* will not deliver a little useless stuff to save his life, lest he should seem to be a Traitor. *Valentinian* would not endure a little drop of Paganish Holy water. We must not dwell in the confines or neighbourhood of Sin. We should put away every shadow of Will-worship, every semblance of an addition to the holy Ordinances, every thing that looks like a conformity to the *Romish* Church; this were the way to be pure from giving offence to our Brethren.

Moreover, they seem to be against *Christian Unity*. The first step to that first sin which brought in enmity into the World, was an addition to God's Word. Ye shall not *touch* it, Gen. 3. 3. This was that that divided God's Ancient People the *Jews*, the *Karai* adhered to the pure Scripture, but the *Tal-*
ladim brought in their Human Traditions, and bried them up as *Lux illa*
pagan, the great Light. The *Pharisees* would have above the Law their own Ceremonies and Traditions, and so they came to separate and divide them-

themselves from others, calling the
 common people *populum terræ*, the peo-
 ple of the earth; and saying to Sinners,
 ne attingas me, touch me not. The Jewish
 Ceremonies troubled the Galatians,
 Gal. i. 7. Circumcision ceasing to be
 Divine any longer, became Concision,
 renting the Church; and the Doctors
 that mixed it with the Gospel, were
 as Dogs, tearing asunder the unity of
 it. When Victor urged a necessity of
 conformity in the observation of
 Easter-day, Irenæus reproves him for
 this, *sicquam pacis perturbatorem*, as a
 troubler of the Churches peace; and in-
 deed there was a horrible breach be-
 tween the Eastern and Western
 Churches about it. When Images, a
 mere Human Invention, were brought
 into the Church, what fierce Contem-
 ptions were there about it? The Greek
 Emperors, *Leo Isaurus*, *Constantine*
 and others, opposing them in the
 East. And on the other side, the Bishops
 of Rome, *Gregory the Second*,
Gregory the Third, and others, still
 upholding them in the West. In the
 Council at Constantinople they were
 condemned.

lemnly condemned ; and the people
 cried out, *hodie salus mundo*. In the
 Council of *Nice* they were advanced
 again even to veneration ; and *Euse-*
bins, for speaking against them, is said
 to be delivered over to a reprobate
 mind, and his Books are anathematiz-
 ed. What an *ἀπομάχια*, a vehement
 Contention was there between the
Greek and *Latin* Churches about le-
 vened and unleavened bread in the Eu-
 charist ; the *Greeks* calling the *Latins*
Azymite, and the *Latins* the *Greeks*,
Fermentarii. Ceremonies and Human
 Inventions in Worship, however they
 may be intended for Unity, are the
 occasions of Contention. Hence *Me-*
lancton, tho he conformed to the Rites
 and Ceremonies in the *Interim*, yet
 wished with tears that they were re-
 moved, because as long as they re-
 mained there would be contention in
 the Church ; and the reason of this is
 evident, The minds of men are not all
 alike, or of an equal temper. Some
 Pious and Learned Men allow of Ce-
 remonies, other Pious and Learned
 Men cannot receive them : In such a
 case

Spond.
 Ann. Anno
 Dom. 754.
 Crab. Conc.
 Tom. 2.
 41

Anselm.
ad querelas
Valeriani,
fol. 149.

case as this, the urging of Uniformity is the loss of Unity. *Anselm* enquiring whence the various Customs in the Church arose, gives this Answer. *Nihil aliud intelligo quam humanorum sensuum diversitates. I know nothing but this, that men have different sentiments of things; that which one man thinks very apt in the Worship of God, that another thinks is not so. When such a necessary thing as Unity is placed in unnecessaries, it is lost; but when it is placed in things like it self, I mean in necessary things, then it is preserved. The Apostles (who as well understood, and as much desired Unity in the Church as any) would lay no other burthen on Christians than necessary things, Act. 15. 28. St. Paul lays down a great many Unities, One body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of all, Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6. but there is not a word of one Ceremony. Those Bishops took the right course for Unity, who being met together in Council, made a Canon which they called *Adiaphoron*, because they left the observation of*
Easter-

Socrat.
Hist. lib. 5.
c. 20.

Easter-day indifferent, as men would themselves. Were indifferent things left in their indifferency, the Unity of the Church would be much greater than it is.

Thus much may suffice touching the Ceremonies; only because there are two Pleas for their innocency, I must consider them.

The one is this; The Ceremonies are only for *decency and order*, and so within that Apostolical Precept, *Let all things be done decently, and in order*, 1 Cor. 14. 40.

I answer, Were the Ceremonies within that Precept, I should beg my pardon, and pronounce them innocent; but I take it they are not within it, and to clear this, I offer these things.

The Evangelical Sacraments, which are God's own Ceremonies, are in themselves, and without any Human dress, worthy of all reverence, the Institution hath put a glory upon them. Human Ceremonies, which are as much below them, as a Cloud is

Nostra Sacramenta tam preclara sunt, ut etiamsi nuda & nullis Sacramentalibus suffulta proponerentur, omni essent veneratione digna. Medina in Aquin. 1, 2. 2. 108. 2. 2.

below

below the Sun, are more apt to darken than illustrate them. When Sacraments are in their pure simplicity, then the splendour of the Holy Signs shines forth ; but when they are muffled up in Human Rites, then the Divine Beauty is obscured. And if Divine Ceremonies need Human to put a decorum upon them, much more do Human Ceremonies need an addition of further Ceremonies for that end, and so there may be Ceremonies upon Ceremonies in *infinitum*.

Our Lord Christ, who knew better than all men what Decency is, never instituted any such Ceremonies. The Apostles, who gave the Rule of Decency, never used them. They did administer Ordinances decently, but without them. Hence it appears that their Precept never extended to them; for had it done so, they would not have omitted them, but had practised that Precept which they had given. The Worship of the Apostles, which was without Ceremonies, was either decent, or undecent, (for Decency and Undecency are *privatively* opposite, and between
wolved
privative

privative opposites there is no *medium* of abnegation in *subjecto capaci*.) If the Apostles Worship, void of all Ceremonies, be decent, then Decency doth not consist in Ceremonies; if undecent, they did not (which cannot be imagined) observe their own Rule of Decency, and act as they taught.

Order and Decency in the Worship of God are things necessary, not merely by a *positive* Law, but by a *natural*. Not only the Apostolical Precept, but the very *dictate of Nature* is, that the Service of God should be performed in an orderly and decent manner. The Heathen Oracle could say, That in the Worship of God men should follow, *morem optimum, the best manner*. Seneca out of Aristotle tells us, That when men have to do with the Gods, they should be, *venereundiores & compositi, modest and composed in their demeanour*. The Light of Nature teacheth us, that we should serve God in a way suitable and congruous to his Divine Majesty. Thus Order and Decency are necessary, but so are not Ceremonies. Hence it appears, that the difference between them

Nat. Quest.
L. 7. c. 30.

them is as great, as between necessary and unnecessary.

*Vide Ames
Medul.
l. 2. c. 13.*

Order is nothing but a right disposition of things, *Decency* is nothing but the seemliness of *Order*. *Order* and *Decency* require not, that some Holy things should be newly ordained; but that those which are ordained by God, should be used in a way congruous to their dignity. The Ceremonies, which are new Appointments, appertain not to *Order* and *Decency*. The institution of somewhat new is one thing; and the right and seemly disposition of that which is instituted, is another.

The other Plea is this. The Ceremonies are not made by our Church in any parts of *Worship*, and therefore there is no offence in them.

I answer, The Ceremonies seem to be parts of *Worship* several ways. They seem to be parts of *Worship* in themselves, as being an honouring of God, at least in some respect. It's true they are not parts of *Worship*, *ratione principii*, because they are not parts of *Divine Institution*. But they seem to be parts of *Worship*, *ratione termin*

as being an honour done to God. There may be a double honour done to God. There is an honour done to him as the Supreme Being, by subjection and resignation : And there is an honour done to him as the Fountain of Grace, by dependance upon him for some Spiritual Gift. Both these seem to be in the use of the Ceremonies. In the use of the Cross, the Infant is resigned to God, *dedicated* to him that died on the Cross, and this looks like Worship. Again, the Ceremonies are *Mystical Teachers*; not *Supream Teachers*, for that were to turn them into Idols; but *Under Teachers*; and therefore in the regular use of them we must depend upon the great Teacher for illumination; and this also seems to be an act of Worship.

They seem to be parts of Worship *relatively*, as they are in conjunction with the holy things of God. The Cross is so interwoven with Baptism in the administration of it, that it looks like a part of it. Before Baptism the Minister prays for those that are dedicated to God; and that *dedication* is, as

Parker Of
the Cross
fol. 115.

the Canon tells us, *by the Cross*. After Baptism, thanks are given that the Child is received into the Congregation, and this is done by the Cross also: For upon making the Cross, the Minister saith, *We receive this Child into the Congregation*. Thus, as Mr. Parker hath noted, the Cross is incorporated into Baptism in the administration of it. They are knit together, *a priori & a posteriori*, by the precedent and subsequent Prayers.

Moreover, they seem to be parts of Worship *reputatively*, as they are highly valued. Our Saviour charges the Pharisees, that they preferred their Traditions above the Commands of God, *Mat. 15. 3, 6, 9*. Their Conscience swallowed up their duty to Parents. The Jews say, that *there is more in the words of the Scribes, than in the words of the Law*; and that it were better to die, than to violate a Tradition. Our Divines charge the very same thing upon the Papists. *Whichever tells Ducent. T. 116.* it was a greater Offence, *Quadragesimam violare quam Dei verbum contemnere*, to break Lent, than to despise the

Word

Word of God. Gregorius Hamburgius, Melch.
 Doctor of Law, was wont to say, *Adam. de*
 That for many years men might *vatis Jure-*
 speak more freely, *de potestate Dei*
quam Papa, of the Power of God, than
of the Pope. And what is the value that
 is now upon Ceremonies among our
 selves? Hath there not been too high a
 rate set upon them? May we not com-
 plain in the words of St. Cyprian, *Epist. 75.*
Divina precepta solvit, & praterit humana
traditio. Human Tradition dissolves and
passes over Divine Precepts? It is appa-
 rent, that if *Learning and Piety* could
 have outweighed a Ceremony, many
 Worthy and Excellent Persons had
 been now in the Church, who are
 at this time out of it. I may add,
 it is also clear, that if that Heat and
 Zeal which hath run out against Non-
 conformity, could have been turned a-
 gainst Impiety and Profaneness, we had
 now been a much more excellent Peo-
 ple than at this time we are. It was
 often the complaint of Erasmus, *Whit.*
Divina contemni, Humana urgeri. That Di-
vine things were contemned, and Human
urged. If this should be our case, it

ad Pomp.

Whit.
 Tom. 2.
 fol. 728.

would be no wonder at all for men to say, that the Ceremonies are made *parts of Worship*.

Thus much touching the Ceremonies: And if what hath been alledged against them be true, the Separation of the Nonconformists can hardly be imagined to be *without cause*. But because not only the Ceremonies, but some *other terms* lay as blocks in their way; I shall add one short word more.

They were by an *Act of Uniformity* deprived of their People, and their People of them. They could not come up to the terms of a publick Ministry, neither would their People come to the publick Ordinances; in this, which I take it, was their case, it is extream hard to charge criminous Schism upon them. When the Emperor put

Socrat.

l. 6. c. 16.

Chrysostom out of his Church, the *Joannites* separated from the Publick, and those not only People, but Bishops and Presbyters; yet I do not know that they were charged with the crime

Theod.

l. 1. cap. 21.

of Schism for it. When *Eustathius* Bishop of *Antioch* was banished, many people and Ministers left the Publick

blow

s H

Allem

Assemblies. Yet I find not that these Separations were charged with the crime of Schism. The Nonconformists being in the same, or a very like case, Charity would make the same construction of them. Thus much touching the sixth Character. Now I proceed to the last.

7thly. Schismatical Separation is not only from a particular Church, but from the *Catholick* one. It is a memorable Passage of the Reverend *Usher*, whose words I shall transcribe.

Neither particular Persons, nor particular Churches, are to work as several divided Bodies by themselves (which is the ground of all Schism) but are to teach, and to be taught, and to do all other Christian Duties, as parts conjoined to the whole, and Members of the same Commonwealth or Corporation. The Excellent Davenant, in his Rules for Peace, saith, Proscindi nec debent nec possunt à communione particularium Ecclesiarum, quæ manent conjunctæ cum Ecclesiâ Catholicâ; Those may not be cut off from communion with particular Churches, who remain joined to the Catholick

In a Sermon before the King.

1624.

Boroughs in his *Irenicum*. fol. 67.

tholick Church. I may add, Those may not be esteemed Schismaticks by any particular Church, who are in conjunction with the Universal. Schismatical Separation is not only from a particular Church, but from the Universal. And is it thus with the Nonconformists? Do they separate from the Church-Catholick? I take it they do not; and for this I shall lay down two or three things.

A Particular Church may be considered two ways, either in that which it hath in *common with other particular Churches*, now, or heretofore in being; or in that which it hath *particular to it self*. A particular Church in the *first respect* acts as a part of the Church-Catholick; but in the *second respect* it acts by it self. A Separation from a particular Church, considered in the *first respect*, is a separation from the Church-Catholick; but a separation from it, considered in the *second respect*, is not so. The Nonconformists differ from our Church, not in that which it hath in *common with other Churches*, but in that which it hath in *particular*. They differ from

from it in *Episcopacy*, so do the Foreign Churches; they differ from its *Liturgy*, so do the Foreign Churches, at least in part. Their Congregations are *distinct*, and *distant* from the Parochial Churches, so is one Parochial Church from another. If the Foreign Churches, notwithstanding such differences, are in unity with our Church, so are the Nonconformists. If the Nonconformists, by reason of such differences, are Schismatics, what are the Foreign Churches which have the same? You will say the case is different. Those of Foreign Churches never did, as our Nonconformists do, go out from our Parochial Churches. Very true, but every total separation doth not amount to Schism; neither have others the same occasion of separation from our Churches as the Nonconformists have.

When a *Letter of Excommunication* is made by those who have particular jurisdiction in a Nation or Church, will justify Separation, and make it no Schism. When the Separation is not from the Church Catholick. But such is the case of the Nonconformists. Should there be such a

Law or Canon made among us, it would justify their Separation, and make it no Schism; therefore their Separation is not from the Church Catholick.

When men separate from a Church in pride, and contempt, as if *they only* were the Church, then the Separation is from the Church Catholick. Thus the *Novatians* thought that the true Church was with them only. Thus the *Donatists* said, that the Church was only in *parte Donati*. Thus the *Papists* say, that the Church is only in *parte Papae*; but the Nonconformists do not do so. They acknowledge our Church to be *an* the Church, they are joined to it in all that which is true unity. They would further bear a part in it, if some stumbling blocks were out of the way. By these things it may appear, that they still remain in conjunction with the Church Catholick.

Thus I have gone over the Characters of Schismatical Separation; and in so doing have briefly examined the Case of the Nonconformists.

Books Printed for, and Sold by Thomas Cockerill, at the Three Legs in the Poultry, near Stocks-Market.

Historical Collections, the 3d Part, in 2 Volumes. Never before Printed; Containing the Principal Matters which happened from the meeting of the Parliament, *November* the 3d. 1640. to the end of the Year 1644. wherein is a particular Account of the Rise and Progress of the Civil War to that Period: Impartially related. Setting forth only Matter of Fact in Order of Time, without Observation or Reflection. By *John Rushworth*. Fol.

A Demonstration of the first Applications of the *Apocalypse*, together with the Consent of the Ancients concerning the Fourth Beast in the 7th. of *Daniel*, and the Beast in the *Revelations*. By *Dnæ Crescener*, D. D. 4to.

A Seasonable Discourse, wherein is examined what is lawful, during the Confusions and Revolutions of Government. 4to.

The Evidence of Things not seen, or divers Spiritual and Philosophical Discourses concerning the state of Holy Men after Death: By that eminently Learned Divine, *M^{rs} Auguſtine*. Translated out of the *French Tongue* by a Minister of the Church of England. 8v.

A Succinct and Seasonable Discourse of the Occasions, Causes, Nature, Rise, Growth and Remedies of Mental Errors. To which is added,

(1.) An Answer to Mr. *Guſtavius* Infant Baptism.
(2.) An Answer to some *Antient* Errors. (3.) A Sermon about Union. 8v.

A Discourse concerning *Unbelief*, by the late Learned Divine *Mr. David Clarkson*. 8v.

Geography

Geography Anatomized: Or, A Compleat Geographical Grammar, being a short and exact Analysis of the whole body of Modern Geography; after a new, plain and easy method, whereby any person may in a short time attain to the knowledge of that most noble and useful Science, &c. To which is subjoined the present state of the European Plantations in the East and West-Indies; with a Reasonable Proposal for the propagation of the Blessed Gospel in all Pagan Countries. Illustrated with divers Maps. By *Samuel Gorton, M. A.* 8vo.

An Exposition of the Assemblies Shorter Catechism, with Practical Inferences from each Question; by John Roberts, late Minister of the Gospel at Durham in Devon. 8vo.

The Future State: Or, A Discourse attempting some History of the Soul's Happiness, in regard to that eternally progressive Knowledge, or eternal increase of Knowledge, and the consequences of it, which is among the Blessed in Heaven; by a Country Gentleman, a Worshipper of God in the way of the Church of England. 12vo.

The Death of Ministers Improved: Or, An Exhortation to the Ministers of Haverly in Gloucestershire, and others, on the much lamented death of that Pious Minister Mr. Henry Stubb: To which is added a Sermon upon that occasion; by Richard Baxter. 12vo.

English Exercises for School-Boys to translate into Latin, containing all the Rules of Grammar, and other necessary Observations, ascending gradually from the lowest to the highest Capacities. By *John Garvis, Schoolmaster.* Fourth Edition. 12vo.

A Short Introduction to Orthography: Or, The method of Teaching the Art of Writing for the common use, but designed for the use of a private Grammar and Writing School. 12vo.

s
a
at
is
a-
le
as
e-
fi-
at
ng
to
in-
it,
m-
ray
Ex-
fer-
n of
which
dard
in-
mar,
adu-
ties
dion
On
r the
a pri

